

R

172032

JPRS-TAC-85-007

7 May 1985

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

19980605 197

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 4

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

REPRODUCED BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

14
121
A06

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

7 May 1985

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

GENERAL

Perle Influence on U.S. Arms Control Policy Deplored (A. Palladin; SOVETSKAYA KUL'TURA, 12 Mar 85)	1
British Cabinet Stops Carbon Technology Shipment to USSR (John Petty; DAILY TELEGRAPH, 30 Mar 85)	4
Spanish Official Rationalizes Refusal To Sign Treaty (Fernando Schwartz; DIARIO 16, 4 Mar 85)	6
'Defeat' for Finland Seen in UN Nordic Zone Vote (Editorial; HELSINGIN SANOMAT, 21 Mar 85)	11
Norwegian Anti-Nuclear Arms Group Announces Campaign Plans (Thorleif Andreassen; AFTENPOSTEN, 11 Apr 85)	13
Australian's Labor MP's Form Antinuclear Lobby Group (Melbourne Overseas Service, 30 Mar 85)	15
Thousands Gather in Australia for Antinuclear Rallies (Melbourne Overseas Service, 31 Mar 85)	16
Beazley on Disarmament Policy	16
Hayden Issues Statement	16
New Zealand Foreign Policy Paper Examines ANZUS Dispute Impact (Wellington Overseas Service, 1 Apr 85)	17

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

Politburo Meeting 21 March Discusses Arms Talks (PRAVDA, 22 Mar 85)	18
Continuing Reportage on U.S.-Soviet Talks (Various sources, various dates)	20
Plenary Meeting 21 March	20
AFP Report	20

Space Arms Meeting 26 March	21
Strategic Weapons Session 27 March	21
Karpov: 396 SS-20's Deployed	21
Negotiating Sessions 4-18 April Reported	
(TASS, various dates)	22
INF Group 4 April	22
Strategic Weapons Group 10 April	22
INF Group 11 April	22
Plenary Session 12 April	22
Space Armaments Group 16 April	22
INF Group 16 April	23
Strategic Armaments Groups Meets in Geneva 17 April	23
INF Group 18 April	23
FRG Foreign Minister Comments on Geneva Talks, U.S. Sincerity	
(Hans-Dietrich Genscher Interview; ZDF, 2 Apr 85).....	24
FRG Defense Minister Cautiously Hopeful Over Geneva Talks	
(DPA, 2 Mar 85)	25
Kohl Views Geneva Talks; SPD Makes Demands	
(DPA, 12 Mar 85)	26
Media View Start of Geneva Disarmament Talks	
(ARD, 12 Mar 85; Cologne Duetschlandfunk Network, 13 Mar 85)	27
TV Commentary, by Peter Staisch	27
Press Review	28
FRG Ex-Minister Views U.S., Soviet Stances on Talks	
(DPA, 28 Mar 85)	29
GDR Examines 'Consequences' of Congress MX Vote	
(Voice of GDR Domestic Service, 27 Mar 85)	30
GDR Commentary on Western Reactions to Geneva Talk Issues	
(ADN International Service, 29 Mar 85; East Berlin Domestic	
Service, 1 Apr 85)	32
ADN Views SDI, Freeze Plan, by Guenter Geidel	32
GDR Radio on Freeze Plan, by Guenter Geidel	33
Leuschner Views Arms Issues, EC Expansion	
(Guenter Leuschner; East Berlin Domestic Service, 1 Apr 85)	35

SPACE ARMS

Soviet Comment on Allied Attitudes to SDI (Various sources, various dates)	38
Howe Voices Doubts, by A. Maslennikov	38
Reagan 'Indignant' at Howe's Stand	39
Perle Also Critical	39
Dumas Criticizes SDI	40
Canadians Alarmed at NORAD Link, by Nikolay Agayants	40
Weinberger Seeks Allied Support	41
Attempts at Persuasion, by Georgiy Zubkov	41
'Growing Doubts' in Europe, by Viktor Shlenov	42
Further on Visits, by Vsevolod Shishkovskiy	43
Japanese Research Plan Hit	44
Israeli Participation Criticized	45
FRG Hit for Backing U.S. on SDI Despite Public Opinion (Yu. Yakhontov; PRAVDA, 5 Apr 85)	46
History, Prospects of U.S. Military Space Programs Discussed (NEW TIMES, No 8, Feb 85)	50
Editorial Introduction	50
Historical Background, by Grigory Khozin	50
Origins of SDI, by Vladimir Kazakov	52
West European Attitudes, by Boris Slavin	54
Technical, Strategic Prospects, Dmitriy Pogorzhel'skiy Interview	56
Soviet Proposals Listed	59
West European Officials' Critiques of SDI Cited (TASS, various dates; APN DAILY REVIEW, 28 Mar 85)	60
British Foreign Secretary	60
French Prime Minister	60
French Foreign Minister	61
Swedish Prime Minister	62
Thatcher, Gorbachev Discuss U.S.' SDI Research (David Healy; PRESS ASSOCIATION, 13 Mar 85)	63
Thatcher Discusses SDI, MX Production (Margaret Thatcher Interview; THE SUNDAY TIMES, 31 Mar 85)	65
UK's Foreign Office Downplays Howe-Perle SDI Exchange (Tom McMullan; PRESS ASSOCIATION, 20 Mar 85)	66
Thatcher Backs 'Star Wars' Research in Commons (PRESS ASSOCIATION, 12 Mar 85)	67

FRG Holds Talks With UK on Strategic Defense Initiative (DPA, 21 Mar 85)	68
Background to Sceptical SDI Response in FRG (Theo Sommer; DIE ZEIT, 22 Feb 85)	69
Munich Conference Prompts Space Defense Discussion (DPA, 9, 10 Feb 85; ZDF, 9 Feb 85)	73
Kohl Supports U.S. Initiative	73
Kohl: Conditions for SDI Support, by Gustav Trampe	74
Kohl Urges Research Cooperation	74
Strauss, Woerner Address Meeting	75
SDP's Ehmke Hits U.S. Plan	76
Kohl Interviewed on U.S. Relations, SDI (Helmut Kohl Interview; DIE ZEIT, 1 Mar 85)	77
FRG's SPD Reiterates Demand for Space Arms Moratorium (DPA, 12 Mar 85)	79
UK Foreign Secretary Howe Interview Clarifies Earlier Remarks on SDI (Roland Hill; DIE PRESSE, 26 Mar 85)	80
Gromyko Fails To Convince Gonzalez To Take Stand on SDI (Enrique Montanez; DIARIO 16, 1 Mar 85)	81
PCF's Gremetz Calls for Opposition to 'Star Wars' (Maxime Gremetz; L'HUMANITE, 6 Apr 85)	83
Soviet, U.S. Stances in Geneva Contrasted (Editorial; RUDE PRAVO, 2 Apr 85)	85
Briefs	
SPD's Ehmke on 'Star Wars'	89
Australia Not Involved in SDI	89

SALT/START ISSUES

Reagan Campaign for Congressional Approval of MX Viewed (G. Vasilyev; PRAVDA, 1 Apr 85)	90
--	----

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

Peace Group Collects Data on Missiles, Bases (HET VRIJE VOLK, 20 Mar 85)	93
German Greens Spokesman Criticizes MX, Belgian Decisions (DPA, 21 Mar 85)	96

FRG Defense Minister on NATO Nuclear Discussions, MX (Manfred Woerner Interview; ZDF, 25 Mar 85)	97
---	----

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE

Finnish Foreign Minister Assessed Stockholm Talks, CSCE (Helsinki International Service, 4 Apr 85)	98
---	----

MUTUAL AND BALANCED FORCE REDUCTIONS

Rapprochement Noted at Vienna MBFR Talks (Peter Berg; ZDF, 8 Mar 85)	99
Warsaw Pact's New Proposals for MBFR Outlined (Ludek Handl, Jozef Sestak; RUDE PRAVO, 30 Mar 85)	101
Daily on New MBFR Proposals, Western Response (M. Smolik; ROLNICKE NOVINY, 28 Mar 85)	105

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

GDR: Washington Continues Chemical Warfare Preparations (Egbert Von Frankenberg; Voice of GDR Domestic Service, 2 Apr 85)	107
---	-----

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

Reportage on Reaction, Opposition To Ship Ban in New Zealand (Various sources, various dates)	109
Opinion Growing Against Stand, by Ray Lilley	109
Lang Reaffirms Southeast Asia Commitment	110
Envoy Defends Policy	111
Lange Steadfastness on Oxford Debate	112

NUCLEAR TESTING

USSR Replies to U.S. Group on Nuclear Tests Moratorium (TASS, 17 Apr 85)	113
Finland Developing Expertise to Monitor Possible Test Ban (HELSINGIN SANOMAT, 15 Apr 85)	114

7 May 85

GENERAL

PERLE INFLUENCE ON U.S. ARMS CONTROL POLICY DEPLORED

PM251612 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KUL'TURA in Russian 12 Mar 85 p 7

[Article by IZVESTIYA own correspondent A. Palladin, written specially for SOVETSKAYA KUL'TURA: "The Pentagon's 'Gray Cardinal'"]

[Text] Washington--Newspapers here recently stunned Americans with the latest evidence of the nearly total ignorance of the rising generation. A poll has shown that a large proportion of schoolchildren and one-half of America's 15-year-olds are incapable of finding their own country on the map. From this point of view U.S. Assistant Defense Secretary Richard Perle's son leaves them far behind despite being only one-third their age. The 5-year-old knows all the countries of Europe except one by heart. Perle Junior considers the Soviet Union--the largest state in the Old World and indeed the whole wide world--to be a nameless desert inhabited by "bad men." This is how his father is teaching him, according to THE WASHINGTON POST.

Perle senior is "enlightening" America's adults in the same way. Obsessed with hatred for our country, he has been trying for 20 years now to teach Americans to reject the very idea of the possibility of peaceful relations with the USSR. Perle began doing this when he was the right-hand man of the late Senator Jackson and is now doing it in a more influential post--as assistant to Weinberger.

Here is a noteworthy fact: although a supporter of the Democratic Party, Richard Perle entered government only with the election of the White House of a Republican president. To do this he did not need to abandon his own convictions, as people sometimes have to do. He was accepted as one of their own because his ideas suited the new administration. Furthermore, it was only under the Republicans that Perle developed to the full and gained an authority and influence which go very far beyond his generally very modest position. THE WASHINGTON POST questioned a large number of knowledgeable people and came to the conclusion that the Pentagon official who has taught his son from infancy to fear and hate the USSR has influenced the formulation of U.S. policy toward our country in the past 4 years more than anyone else in the current Washington administration.

The essence of this policy is very well known: It is to fuel tension and promote an unbridled arms race. THE WASHINGTON POST remarked that Perle has made his presence felt everywhere, even in spheres apparently far removed from his own direct duties, such as foreign trade. He has made his main contribution to the undermining of Soviet-U.S. relations in a sphere which affects the vital interests of all mankind--disarmament.

"The most serious individual force opposing an arms control accord" is how republican Senator Larry Pressler spoke of Perle. He was described in virtually the same words by Jeremy Stone, head of the Federation of U.S. Scientists, who added that in Perle's eyes arms control is "dangerous" because it is incompatible with Pentagon and NATO interests. As for the "disarmament ideas" put forward by Perle himself, they have been called "absurd" and "not fit" for discussion even by such a figure as A. Haig, who served as head of the State Department in the Reagan Administration.

It was Perle, THE WASHINGTON POST recalls, who previously persuaded Weinberger (who in turn persuaded Reagan) to propose the "zero option," which was known to be unacceptable to the USSR and led to the breaking off of the Geneva talks on nuclear arms limitation in Europe. And later on he insisted, despite objections from the CIA and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, on an equally futile draft international treaty banning chemical weapons. Despite all that, Perle pays lipservice to the idea of talks with the Soviet Union--so long as they offer the United States unilateral advantages or soothe the Western public like a lullaby, thereby making it possible for military budgets to be increased at the same time.

The question arises: How has this mediocre official contrived virtually single-handed for so many years to sabotage arms reduction, which, if you believe the White House's proclamations, is the present U.S. Administration's most important task? Can this be possible even if Perle does indeed possess the features of a latter-day Machiavelli that are attributed to him: namely, fanaticism, treachery, arrogance, and the ability to intrigue?

Of course not. The effectiveness of the line pursued by Perle on behalf of and for the sake of the military-industrial complex' interests has been helped, according to THE WASHINGTON POST, by the "administration's confusion and inexperience on arms control issues." Furthermore, the U.S. assistant defense secretary thinks and acts as one with his boss: Whatever he proposes is always in tune with "Weinberger's natural instincts" (to quote THE WASHINGTON POST again). The latter, as we all know, has access to the White House at any time of the day or night and enjoys unquestioned authority there.

Against his opponents Perle uses either demagoguery or psychological terror, branding all glimmers of common sense as "sympathy toward the Russians," since in present-day Washington, as Stone has said, "The more right-wing you are, the stronger your position is and the fewer curbs there are on your methods" of fighting. In addition--and Perle has long understood this--it is far easier in the United States to torpedo disarmament agreements than to ratify them.

Perhaps now, on the eve of the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva, the Pentagon's "gray cardinal" has realized the perniciousness of his views and actions from the standpoint of international security--especially since he himself was included in Washington's delegation for the Geneva meeting in January? Alas, no...Hardly had the Americans returned home after the meeting in January than Perle's boss began publicly casting doubt on the agreement that had been reached and, in effect, on Washington's sincerity. Perle himself let slip the following highly significant phrase: "Everything went so smoothly so long as no talks were held!" There is no need to explain that the road to the nuclear missile hell is paved with that "smoothness" for which he pines.

CSO: 1807/259

7 May 85

GENERAL

BRITISH CABINET STOPS CARBON TECHNOLOGY SHIPMENT TO USSR

LD301049 London DAILY TELEGRAPH in English 30 Mar 85 p 1

[Article by John Petty, commercial correspondent: "Security Ban on Deal With Russia; Customs Intervene To Stop Cargo"]

[Excerpt] A shipment of Scottish-made equipment that would have given Russia vital help in improving warhead-carrying rockets has been halted at the last moment by government intervention.

Vacuum induction furnaces supplied by Consarc Engineering of Bellshill, Glasgow, would have enabled Russia to make carbon-carbon, a lightweight new material with immense heat-resisting qualities which is used to coat rocket cones. Warheads on existing Russian missiles do not have such effective heat resistance when re-entering the earth's atmosphere. This can cause them to wobble and go off target.

A loophole in security measures nearly let the consignment of furnaces through to Russia. Furnaces specifically designed to produce the carbon-carbon material are on a banned list. The Consarc furnaces did not come into this category, but at the last minute with the Soviet cargo ship, Mekhanik Yevgrafov, already in British waters to collect the equipment, it was realised they could easily be adapted.

The contract had been won openly and with government approval. It was cleared by the Trade and Industry Department. Then came the alert. An interdepartmental government committee orders Customs and excise to intervene and the equipment was impounded at Glasgow docks.

It is believed that the Cabinet took the decision to revoke the export license.

Exports Vetted by Committee

Consarc, the subsidiary of an American company, will be able to seek compensation from government or through the Export Credits Guarantee Department, the state-sponsored insurance organisation for exporters.

It was stressed last night that Consarc had in no way done anything wrong in accepting the order and arranging to ship it. Carbon technology is a field in which Britain leads the world and in which Russia lags behind the West.

An international committee, known as COCOM meets regularly to draw up lists of strategically-sensitive materials and equipment which may not be exported to Communist countries.

consists of members of NATO and a few other nations, such as Japan. COCOM's decisions have no legal force in Britain. But the government follows its recommendations through the Export of Goods (Control) order 1981.

The Government is conducting an "urgent review" of security arrangements to prevent anything else slipping through the net. Exporters are being consulted to make sure there are no more loopholes to be plugged. Computer equipment has featured strongly in the list of goods kept out of the Russian bloc.

There was a big row between Britain and America in 1982 over the shipment of Scottish-made turbines by John Brown Engineering to Russia.

0: 5240/007

7 May 85

GENERAL

SPANISH OFFICIAL RATIONALIZES REFUSAL TO SIGN TREATY

Madrid DIARIO 16 in Spanish 4 Mar 85 p 18

[Article by Fernando Schwartz: "Spain and the Nuclear Arms Nonproliferation Treaty"]

[Text] Spain has nothing against the Nuclear Arms Nonproliferation Treaty, says the author of this article, who is director of the Office of Diplomatic Information. But this does not mean that it should accept it, inasmuch as sanctioning the preponderance of the two superpowers is discriminatory against countries that do not have nuclear weapons. Whatever the case, the results after 17 years of existence of the treaty are not very encouraging.

A few days ago, the head of the government stated that it seemed humiliating to sign a treaty such as the Nuclear Arms Nonproliferation Treaty, which contains a certain degree of hypocrisy.

A few days later, EL PAIS devoted an editorial to the subject, saying that there are only two logical options on the matter: "To proceed, as France and China have done, with a foreign policy including the possession of nuclear weapons," making it logical not to sign the treaty, or sign it and thereby contribute to "a policy of limiting the countries possessing nuclear weapons to the maximum extent and on that basis, bring pressure on countries owning such weapons to have a policy of control, reduction and, in the final analysis, a radical ban on nuclear arms." This is a formidable catalogue of aspirations that the original signers of the Nonproliferation Treaty proposed in 1968. They did not know that later events would defeat them.

In 1985, the Spanish Government enjoys the prospect of a number of years enabling it to approach and consider the matter of whether or not to sign the Nonproliferation Treaty calmly and without haste.

Even a superficial analysis of the issue suggests that Spain has no interest in deciding for one of the two logical options proposed by EL PAIS:

1 -- If we should admit that we are able to manufacture a small number of nuclear weapons at a tolerable cost, they would obviously lack excessive usefulness as deterrents, let alone effective use.

2 -- Furthermore, the Nonproliferation Treaty is a congenitally unequal treaty (it tends to consolidate the nuclear preponderance of the two superpowers) and has not helped check the growth of nuclear arsenals (on the contrary, it has shown that it is compatible with the nuclear arms race). It does not seem to have warded off the threat of a nuclear conflict, it penalizes the condition of nations without nuclear arms by imposing, as we shall see, discriminatory obligations, and finally, it renders possible the introduction of foreign nuclear arms in non-nuclear signatory countries and their possible use by receiver nations.

Seeking another way to halt nuclear proliferation insofar as it is concerned, Spain decided over 20 years ago to follow a policy of effective nuclear limitation, signing the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty in 1963 and establishing a policy of not manufacturing atomic weapons and of the denuclearization of the national territory, a policy firmly maintained to date.

Reasons for Hypocrisy

Where does this alleged hypocrisy of the Nonproliferation Treaty reside and consequently, what fuels the doubts of the Spanish Government as it comes time to sign it? A brief analysis of the contents of the treaty will make it possible to shed light on the matter and verify its real scope.

The Nuclear Arms Nonproliferation Treaty dates from 1 July 1968. Among the nuclear powers, the signers include the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union, but not France, China or India.

Let us look at the main clauses:

1 -- For the purposes of this treaty, a nuclear country is one that has manufactured and exploded a weapon or other nuclear explosive device previous to 1 January 1967 (Article 9, 3).

This is a key clause of the treaty because it establishes the double category of countries having nuclear weapons and those that do not, assigning them different rights and obligations. Since only three nuclear powers (the United States, the USSR and the United Kingdom) signed the treaty, it has become in practice an instrument aligning, on the one side, the two nuclear superpowers (which together have 97 percent of the nuclear warheads now existing) and, on the other, non-nuclear countries.

2 -- Signatory nations declare their intention of putting an end to the nuclear arms race as soon as possible and adopting measures to promote nuclear disarmament (preamble, 9).

In 1985, this clause appears to be more ironic than anything else.

3 -- Signatory nations express their desire of facilitating a halt in the manufacture of nuclear weapons, liquidating existing arsenals and eliminating nuclear weapons and their launching means (preamble, 12).

It seems almost superfluous to describe the response of reality to this solemn desire. But there is something more. In this paragraph, "launching means" are mentioned, which are not the atomic weapons themselves. These means (missiles, planes, cannons), developed for the firing of nuclear warheads, are in the hands of different nations that have not signed the treaty (naturally, several of them belong to NATO) and that have not only not given them up, but have developed them and made them more powerful.

4 -- Nuclear nations are required not to transfer nuclear arms or explosives to anyone or help non-nuclear nations in their manufacture (Article 1).

Along with Article 2, which prohibits non-nuclear countries from receiving atomic weapons from anyone, forms the operative nucleus of nonproliferation. They are extraordinarily clear precepts, but let us see what actually happens.

First of all, the nuclear countries have no obligation whatsoever to halt or reduce their nuclear arsenals, which explains their proliferation.

Second, in view of these standards, one should ask what the approximately 6,000 nuclear warheads are doing placed by the United States in the United Kingdom, Belgium, Holland, Germany, Italy, Greece and Turkey, all signers of the treaty. Likewise, one should ask what is happening to the atomic missiles installed by the USSR in some of its allies as "countermeasures" and with an undetermined number of nuclear warheads and arms, all in treaty countries.

Let me make myself clear: It is not a matter of questioning the military policy of the two superpowers and their somewhat overwhelming ratios. Rather, it is a question of pointing out that for the implementation of such a policy, the treaty does not appear necessary. One would rather say that it is a vaguely hypocritical institution.

Double Key

Part of the American atomic weapons in Europe are with American units, under their exclusive control and ownership. One would presume that the same is true of Soviet arms. In neither of the two cases is there a violation of the treaty since the latter only refers prudently to the transfer of weapons to another nation. In these cases, there is no more than installation in the territory of a recipient country. This is authorized by the treaty. But there is a more complex case affecting many of the American weapons in Europe: the "double key system."

Under this system, atomic weapons, whose ownership and control continue to be American, are integrated into military units of the recipient country and the launching means are its property. In a given case, the recipient country could ask that atomic warheads be transferred to it. The American command could comply. No one would be violating the treaty. Actually, it cannot be said that the concept of nonproliferation contemplated in the treaty does not permit many things.

What would happen if war should break out and the nuclear country should transfer control and ownership of the weapon to the non-nuclear country that will fire it

with its own launching means? Obviously, this would be a violation of the treaty, right? Wrong. In 1968, the United Kingdom and the United States declared that "the Nonproliferation Treaty would not be relevant in the event that a decision should be made to go to war...." Consequently, the nontransfer of atomic weapons to non-nuclear countries is established in the treaty in very firm terms, but with one exception: the possibility of their actual use.

5 -- Every non-nuclear nation that signs the treaty is required to accept safeguards in an agreement worked out with the International Atomic Energy Agency for the purpose of verifying compliance with its obligations with respect to preventing nuclear energy for peaceful purposes to be diverted to the production of nuclear arms or explosives (Article 3, 1).

More Controls

This clause adds more controls for non-nuclear countries, duplicating the discrimination against them, while the nuclear states are not forced to submit to safeguards and simultaneously, while having the right to demand that non-nuclear nations comply with them.

6 -- An international accord will be drafted and an international organization set up to transfer to non-nuclear nations the benefits of the peaceful uses of nuclear explosions (Article 5).

Although all countries belonging to the treaty have the right to develop and use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes and in fact, there have been many examples of the transfer of technology bilaterally, the accord and organization mentioned in Article 5 do not even exist in draft form.

7 -- The treaty can be amended by a majority of votes, including those of all nuclear nations that are signers of the treaty (Article 8, 2).

In other words, the Soviet Union, the United States or the United Kingdom can veto any attempt to reform the treaty.

Spain has nothing against the Nonproliferation Treaty or those who have signed it. On the contrary, it understands and respects it. But this does not mean that it must necessarily accept it. The treaty sanctions the nuclear preponderance of the two superpowers, based on a division of the world into countries that have or do not have them, and it discriminates against the latter, denying them safety guarantees, authorizing the installation of foreign atomic weapons in their territory and imposing obligations and limitations on them.

In addition, it contains no obligations to limit and reduce atomic arsenals and it is compatible with the possibility that a non-nuclear signer might come to use atomic weapons transferred to it by a nuclear power.

If Spain should decide to sign the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, with the resulting limitations on national sovereignty, the question is knowing whether the sacrifice would be necessary.

It is a sacrifice that would have value only if the act were truly useful for us and the international community. In view of the results in 17 years of existence of the Nonproliferation Treaty, doubt is a valid proposition.

11,464

CSO: 5200/2545

7 May 85

GENERAL

'DEFEAT' FOR FINLAND SEEN IN UN NORDIC ZONE VOTE

Helsinki HELSINGIN SANOMAT in Finnish 21 Mar 85 p 2

/Editorial: "The Zone Plan Has Become Unrealistic"/

/Text/ Finland has experienced an obvious defeat in the United Nations. The 21-nation work group lead by Assistant Secretary of State Klaus Tornudd discussing nuclear-free zones did not reach any kind of mutual agreement and is not able to produce a report in the matter to the UN General Assembly. The group ended up with a failure although it received a long time extension. The intention had been to deliver the report to the general assembly of last fall.

The efforts of Tornudd's working group collapsed on two areas. The two potential nuclear weapons countries India and Argentina justified the negative attitude of the developing countries by stating that the current nuclear weapons countries have not held their promises to prevent the nuclear race. They had originally entered such binding agreements when they sold the nuclear ban treaty in 1968 to countries without nuclear weapons.

The industrial countries belonging to the Western military alliance for their part rejected the zone plan report when they in Tornudd's work group opposed the zone plan. The specific target of the opposition was the nuclear-free zone of the Nordic countries as well as the demilitarization zones in Central Europe.

The Nordic nuclear-free zone has become the big dead body of Finnish foreign policy in today's world where the nuclear armament is continuing full speed between the leading nations of the two military unions. No longer possible is the large zone based on agreements that President Urho Kekkonen tried to achieve ever since 1963, and which would be guaranteed by the superpowers and by a strengthened international position.

To continue the work for the original goal is now unrealistic. There is reason to hold off from trying to achieve the same thing.

The fact is, the Nordic countries already form a nuclear-free zone in practice in peace time. It is further possible for Denmark and Norway to consider permanent nuclear-free status as a part of a broader solution if the superpower-policy situation changes. Finland and Sweden have announced that they will stay nuclear-free under all circumstances.

Finland and Sweden also enjoy negative security guarantees by the superpowers. The nuclear weapon nations did indeed in 1978 at the UN special disarmament session make unilateral commitments that they would not use nuclear weapons or threaten nuclear-free states with such weapons. The expressions of such wishes and commitments make Finland and Sweden into a nuclear-free zone. That has to be sufficient for now.

The collapse of the Tornudd work group forebodes great worldwide chaos in problems regarding nuclear weapons. The fact that the developing countries are angry with nuclear weapons countries which are continuing their nuclear armament race, threatens to demolish the entire nuclear ban treaty when it ends in 1995.

As early as a decade from now several tens of nations will be able to construct their own nuclear weapons quite legally. That would mean that nuclear weapons would soon end up also in completely irresponsible hands. That is no advantage for the superpowers, because their power is based on the nuclear weapons monopoly. In that sense the torpedoing of the zone venture is not the actual problem, but the beginning of the handling of the problem.

9662

CSO: 5200/2534

GENERAL

NORWEGIAN ANTI-NUCLEAR ARMS GROUP ANNOUNCES CAMPAIGN PLANS

Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 11 Apr 85 p 7

[Article by Thorleif Andreassen: "'No to Nuclear Arms' Active Prior to Election"]

[Text] Next Monday, the group "No to Nuclear Arms" will begin its election campaign. At that time, a nationwide "action week" will begin, during which the peace movement will aim particularly at getting politicians to support two of the movement's primary demands: the freeze and a consistent position on arms in space. Members of the public will be urged to send cards to those representatives in Parliament whom they feel are "theirs" with a challenge to oppose the stationing of cruise missiles. The objective of the action week is to win voters to its side and thereby to put increased pressure on politicians during this election campaign year.

The debate on space arms has had an effect like a fireplace bellows on the activities of "No to Nuclear Arms." "There is a glow in the embers in our movement. A breeze has them flaring up at the moment," daily leader Ole Kopreitan tells AFTENPOSTEN.

All doubts that the peace movement is arming itself for an offensive dash to election day have been cast aside. Under the motto, "Parliamentary majority against space arms," it will agitate nationwide for disarmament. Booths, appeals, peace masses and confrontation meetings will dominate the week.

On 16 April, there will be a meeting in the Liberal Party's headquarters in Oslo with space war as the theme of the debate. The debaters will be government secretary Torbjorn Froysnes from the Foreign Department, the director of the Norwegian Foreign Policy Institute, Johan Jorgen Holst, and professor Erik Alfsen from "No to Nuclear Arms." Six days later, the disarmament debate will take place at Tveita Association headquarters. On that occasion, the parties are to state their views on preemptive strikes with nuclear weapons, the Nordic area as a nuclear free zone and on the freeze in the nuclear arms race. The non-socialist parties have declined to participate in this meeting. But Nils Petter Gleditsch from the Peace Research Institute has not declined and is to lead the panel debate.

After the conclusion of the action week, "No to Nuclear Arms" will prepare a new offensive which is to begin on 15 June--an international campaign in which a number of peace movement groups will cooperate against the stationing of cruise missiles.

Thereafter, there will be a summer camp on Tromoya from 6 to 13 July. There will be many invited guests from the Nordic countries. The theme is to be the Nordic area as a nuclear free zone.

12578

CSO: 5200/2577

7 May 85

GENERAL

AUSTRALIA'S LABOR MP'S FORM ANTINUCLEAR LOBBY GROUP

BK300742 Melbourne Overseas Service in English 0430 GMT 30 Mar 85

[Text] Some federal Labor members of Parliament have formed an antinuclear lobby group and one its aims will be to pressure the government to support New Zealand's anti-nuclear stand. The group from both sides of the party calls itself Labor Parliamentarians for a Nuclear-Free Australia. One of its twenty-eight members, Mr Lent, says it will also push for a treaty banning nuclear tests and a nuclear-free Pacific.

A Radio Australia reporter in Canberra says the lobby group wishes to place the Australian Labor Party in the forefront of the antinuclear movement and says it will not be deterred from controversial topics such as visits by nuclear ships. New Zealand has banned visits by nuclear ships, alienating the United States and putting at risk the ANZUS treaty which links those two countries with Australia.

The left wing of the Labor Party has already said Australia should support New Zealand in its antinuclear stand. The new group also wishes to win back supporters who may have been alienated by the party's recent record over nuclear issues. One issue was the MX missile test, in which Australia declined to help America monitor the splashdown of missiles off Australia's southeast coast. Our reporter says the group believes that the way the federal government withdrew its offer to help America with the MX test is an indication that it can be forced to respond.

CSO: 5200/4310

GENERAL

THOUSANDS GATHER IN AUSTRALIA FOR ANTINUCLEAR RALLIES

Beazley on Disarmament Policy

BK310656 Melbourne Overseas Service in English 0430 GMT 31 Mar 85

[Text] Thousands of people are gathering across Australia in preparation for antinuclear rallies in the major cities and towns. Similar rallies this time last year attracted 250,000 people, and the organizers hope there will be similar crowds this time. The biggest rallies are expected to be in Melbourne and Sydney, where at least 100,000 people could gather in each city.

Meanwhile, the defense minister, Mr Beazley says the government is disappointed that a large number of traditional Labor voters, especially the young, are disillusioned about the government's record on nuclear issues. He said the government's foreign affairs policies were designed to achieve effective nuclear disarmament among the superpowers and were getting results. The defense minister said he believed the government and today's antinuclear marches shared the same hopes and aspirations about removing the nuclear threat to the world. Mr Beazley's comments were made during a television interview.

Hayden Issues Statement

BK310852 Melbourne Overseas Service in English 0830 GMT 31 Mar 85

[Excerpt] Thousands of Australians took part in antinuclear rallies across the country today, as the government released a special message saying that it was striving to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. In Melbourne alone, organizers estimated 110,000 people took part in a peace march which is traditionally held on Palm Sunday, the Sunday before Easter.

In a Palm Sunday message released in Canberra, the minister for foreign affairs, Mr Hayden, said Australia was working hard, through international forums, to help prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. He said Australia was pressing for the early conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty and building a treaty for a nuclear-free zone in its own region. Mr Hayden said Australia could and must make a contribution to nuclear disarmament. It could not retreat into isolationism and tell the world to go away.

CSO: 5200/4310

GENERAL

NEW ZEALAND FOREIGN POLICY PAPER EXAMINES ANZUS DISPUTE IMPACT

HK010618 Wellington Overseas Service in English 0600 GMT 1 Apr 85

[Text] A foreign affairs policy paper released today says the ban on nuclear ship visits here has not damaged the security of New Zealand, as there is still no current identifiable threat to this country, but the paper says the change in the ANZUS relationship means that New Zealand will have to do more to safeguard its security interests in the South Pacific.

The paper says it should be assumed that [words indistinct] nor that a satisfactory security in the South Pacific will continue without vigorous action by New Zealand. The paper says it's going to mean more effort from New Zealand in surveillance and exercising in the Pacific, a greater presence on the ground, and more defense aid for island governments. The paper says New Zealand must preserve as far as possible its bilateral relationship with the United States, as well as developing the present defense relationship with Australia, particularly in the South Pacific.

CSO: 5200/4311

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

POLITBURO MEETING 21 MARCH DISCUSSES ARMS TALKS

PM220937 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Mar 85 First Edition p 1

[TASS report: "At the CPSU Central Committee Politburo"]

[Excerpts] At its regular meeting the CPSU Central Committee Politburo discussed tasks stemming from the guidelines set by the extraordinary plenum of the CPSU Central Committee directed at mobilizing the party, state bodies, public organizations, and all components of the economic mechanism, at achieving a decisive turn towards placing the economy on the track of intensification and acceleration of the social and economic development of Soviet society. Special emphasis was placed on the need to strengthen labor, state, and party discipline, to resolutely struggle against any manifestations of showiness and irresponsibility, everything that contradicts the socialist norms of life.

It was stressed that the Soviet Union will further firmly and consistently pursue the course of peace and progress, adhere to the Leninist principles of peace and peaceful coexistence.

The most important thing today is to rally and build up efforts aimed at preventing the arms race in outer space and stopping it on earth, at limiting and reducing nuclear armaments, which would become a step eventually leading to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere. It is in this direction that the Soviet Union will make efforts at the Soviet-U.S. talks that recently began in Geneva.

Having studied Nikolay Tikhonov's and Andrey Gromyko's report on the meeting with French External Relations Minister Roland Dumas, the Politburo noted that this meeting had once again demonstrated the certain closeness of the positions of our countries on such important matters as the need to return to the policy of detente, the strengthening of European security, the maintenance of the balance of forces at the lowest possible level, and the prevention of an arms race in outer space. Note was also made of the mutual striving of the USSR and France to further deepen mutually advantageous cooperation and exchanges in the fields of economy, technology, and culture along with the development of political dialogue.

The Politburo approved Vladimir Shcherbitskiy's report on the results of the visit of a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation to the United States. The Politburo

pointed to the vast work carried out by the delegation during meetings and conversations with representatives of the U.S. administration and Congress, as well as U.S. public and business circles, to explain the Soviet Union's principled stand on questions of Soviet-U.S. relations and cardinal international problems, above all those related to the ending of the nuclear arms race and the prevention of space militarization. The Politburo emphasized the importance of the further development of ties with the United States also along the lines of supreme legislative bodies in the interests of improving mutual understanding and organizing mutually advantageous cooperation in the interests of consolidating peace.

CSO: 5200/1048

7 May 85

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

CONTINUING REPORTAGE ON U.S.-SOVIET TALKS

Plenary Meeting 21 March

LD211237 Moscow TASS in English 1235 GMT 21 Mar 85

[Text] Geneva March 21 TASS--The delegations of the USSR and the United States held a plenary meeting at the talks on nuclear and space arms here today.

AFP Report

AU261648 Paris AFP in English 1639 GMT 26 Mar 85

[Text] Geneva, March 26 (AFP) -- The U.S.-Soviet negotiating group on space weapons, which was set up last Friday, held its first working session today at the Soviet Mission to the United Nations in Geneva. The U.S. side was led by Max Kampelman, chief U.S. negotiator to the new arms reductions talks, in a three-hour meeting.

Mr. Kampelman returned this morning from Washington where he backed President Reagan's efforts to convince Congress that money should be spent on the controversial MX missile. The U.S. Administration fears that defeat of the MX in Congress could undermine the U.S. position at the arms talks here.

The Soviet delegation was headed by Yuliy Kvitsinskiy, who previously led the Soviets in negotiations on intermediate nuclear forces. An agreement to disclose nothing was adhered to and observers were reduced to speculating that the talks were limited to each sides' theoretical position on space weapons, which do not yet exist and are not likely to be operational before the end of the century.

But Viktor Israelyan, Moscow's delegate to the separate U.N. Conference on Disarmament here, who is not part of the secrecy agreement, today proposed to the meeting that a treaty blocking any attempt to use space for military aims should be negotiated. Mr Israelyan accused the United States in a stinging attack of being "always at the origin of all arms races." It was the Americans, he said, who "without any military need, dropped the first two atomic bombs in history killing 273,000 at Hiroshima and 195,000 at Nagasaki."

Observers said this treaty proposal, if one day signed, would put an end to the U.S. "star wars" scheme known as the strategic defence initiative to protect the United States from incoming nuclear missiles.

Negotiations on space weapons, given Mr Israelyan's speech here today, look set to be extremely difficult, observers said. The Soviet killing of U.S. Major Arthur Nicholson on a patrol in East Germany on Sunday was thought unlikely to improve the prospects.

Tomorrow the strategic arms group is due to meet and followed by the Euromissiles group on Thursday, in line with the decision to divide the U.S.-Soviet talks into three working groups according to weapon types.

Space Arms Meeting 26 March

LD261638 Moscow TASS in English 1636 GMT 26 Mar 85

[Text] Geneva March 26 TASS--A meeting of the group on space weapons was held here today at the Soviet-U.S. negotiations on nuclear and space arms.

Strategic Weapons Session 27 March

LD271225 Moscow TASS in English 1222 GMT 27 Mar 85

[Text] Geneva March 27 TASS--A session of the group on strategic weapons was held here today within the framework of the Soviet-U.S. negotiations on nuclear and space arms.

Karpov: 396 SS-20's Deployed

WA280700 Amsterdam DE VOLKSKRANT in Dutch 13 Mar 85 p 5

[Excerpts] Soviet negotiator Viktor Karpov and his U.S. counterpart Max Kampelman agreed last Tuesday that the new arms negotiations which began yesterday would remain "strictly confidential."

Karpov, when asked whether the Soviet Union now had 396 SS-20 missiles deployed (NATO estimates the number at 414), Karpov replied that there were "no mysteries." "The number is correct," he stated, repeating, "the number is correct."

CSO: 5200/1052

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

NEGOTIATING SESSIONS 4-18 APRIL REPORTED

INF Group 4 April

LD041433 Moscow TASS in English 1424 GMT 4 Apr 85

[Text] Geneva, 4 April, TASS--A session of the group on nuclear intermediate-range armaments was held here today within the framework of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons.

Strategic Weapons Group 10 April

LD101128 Moscow TASS in English 1120 GMT 10 Apr 85

[Text] Geneva, 10 April, TASS--The group for strategic weapons had a meeting here today in the frameworks of Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms.

INF Group 11 April

LD111324 Moscow TASS in English 1259 GMT 11 Apr 85

[Text] Geneva, 11 April, TASS--The group on intermediate-range nuclear weapons met here today within the framework of the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons.

Plenary Session 12 April

LD121330 Moscow TASS in English 1326 GMT 12 Apr 85

[Text] Geneva, 12 April, TASS--A plenary meeting of delegations of the USSR and the U.S. at the talks on nuclear and space weapons was held here today.

Space Armaments Group 16 April

LD161208 Moscow TASS in English 1202 GMT 16 Apr 85

[Text] Geneva, 16 April, TASS--A meeting of the group on space armaments has been held here today at the Soviet-American negotiations on nuclear and space armaments.

INF Group 16 April

LD161209 Moscow TASS in English 1206 GMT 16 Apr 85

[Text] Geneva, 16 April, TASS--A meeting of the group on nuclear intermediate-range armaments has been held here today at the Soviet-American negotiations on nuclear and space armaments.

Strategic Armaments Groups Meets in Geneva 17 April

LD171225 Moscow TASS in English 1159 GMT 17 Apr 85

[Text] Geneva, 17 April, TASS--The group of strategic armaments held a session here today within the framework of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space armaments.

INF Group 18 April

LD181151 Moscow TASS in English 1139 GMT 18 Apr 85

[Text] Geneva, 18 April, TASS--The group on intermediate-range nuclear armaments held a session here today within the framework of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space armaments.

CSO: 5200/1097

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

FRG FOREIGN MINISTER COMMENTS ON GENEVA TALKS, U.S. SINCERITY

DW030807 Mainz ZDF Television Network in German 1700 GMT 2 Apr 85

[Interview with Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher by correspondent Helmut Illert at Geneva airport on 2 April--recorded]

[Text] [Illert] Minister Genscher, following your talks with the U.S. delegation in Geneva, are you bringing back to Bonn with you any new aspects or any initial interim results from the disarmament dialogue between East and West?

[Genscher] Our impression has been strengthened that the Americans are very seriously negotiating with the objective of attaining constructive results in connection with intermediate-range missiles and intercontinental missiles. This also applies to the military utilization of space. The negotiating climate is quite obviously such that it also reflects a serious interest on the part of the Soviets in achieving results. However, we must be aware of the complicated nature of the topics under negotiation and their interconnection. This means we must warn against expecting rapid results.

CSO: 5200/2551

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

FRG DEFENSE MINISTER CAUTIOUSLY HOPEFUL OVER GENEVA TALKS

LD021311 Hamburg DPA in German 1202 GMT 2 Mar 85

[Text] Bad Boll, 2 Mar (DPA) -- With a view to the forthcoming arms control negotiations, Federal Defense Minister Manfred Woerner has expressed subdued hope about the start of a reduction in intercontinental missiles. Woerner said on Saturday at a meeting of the Evangelical Academy in Bad Boll (Goeppingen District) that he was "anything but pessimistic" that there will be a drastic and controlled reduction in the number of offensive weapons.

The CDU politician referred to concrete signs that the talks in Geneva will be successful. The United States had overcome its period of weakness and the USSR's armament growth was increasingly influenced by its economic problems, and not least, both sides had something to offer in the negotiations.

Woerner stressed that the Soviet Union had returned to the negotiating table through a realistic assessment of the situation. It had had to accept the fact that the West had not allowed itself to be divided. Moreover, the American plans for a missile defense system in space had led to Soviet concern about inferiority. Provided that the West renounced superiority, Woerner said, the next Soviet leadership will recognize the futility of banking on military might.

CSO: 5200/2551

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

KOHL VIEWS GENEVA TALKS; SPD MAKES DEMANDS

LD130635 Hamburg DPA in German 1604 GMT 12 Mar 85

[Text] Bonn, 12 Mar (DPA)--Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl views the chances for the U.S.-Soviet disarmament negotiations in Geneva with "subdued optimism." In an interview in QUICK magazine prereleased today by the Federal Press Office, Kohl says that success is possible. In his opinion both sides are ready to negotiate, but are still far apart in their views. "We need much patience."

Kohl believes that the Germans on both sides, too, despite different outlooks, could contribute a great deal to the success of the Geneva negotiations. The GDR is unmistakably indicating, like other Eastern bloc countries, that it is now imperative to reach real disarmament and real detente. If the GDR exercises its influence within the Warsaw Pact in this respect, then that is a good thing.

The SPD has reaffirmed its demand for a moratorium to be imposed at the start of the Geneva talks which would exclude the deployment of further nuclear missiles and the "militarization of space." SPD parliamentary leader Hans-Jochen Vogel said today that otherwise there was a danger of the arms race continuing or even accelerating.

The FRG Trade Union Federation appealed to the negotiating partners to make every effort "to achieve full renunciation of all nuclear weapons."

CSO: 5200/2551

7 May 85

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

MEDIA VIEW START OF GENEVA DISARMAMENT TALKS

TV Commentary

DW131059 Hamburg ARD Television Network in German 2130 GMT 12 Mar 85

[Commentary by Peter Staisch in the "Tagesthemen" program]

[Text] Negotiations between Washington and Moscow on arms control have been resumed in Geneva today. In early January this fact alone in itself nearly caused a sensation, but after the death of Chernenko and the lighting nomination of 54-year-old Mikhail Gorbachev, the new beginning of Geneva II is even more important. After all, the negotiations can indeed profit from the fact that both superpowers are now led by men who have real leeway for action for the next few years.

Both are vested with the political power which their respective system is capable of providing: Ronald Reagan with a more than convincing election victory, and Mikhail Gorbachev with the nomination by the internal circles of the CPSU, and that obviously already while Chernenko was still alive. This suggests that Gorbachev has left the power struggles behind.

Now both sides know where they stand. This variant of reliability might perhaps have been further enhanced had President Reagan personally gone to attend the funeral ceremonies for Chernenko, as did the heads of state and government of his Atlantic partners. Still, the argument is justified that a well prepared summit meeting 6 months from now would benefit the relations between the two states more. Yet, a meeting on the edge of events, meant as a reverence to the dead and being unburdened by any summit prestige, now could have brought to the surface a great deal of what for years has been buried under mutual distrust.

Kohl and Honecker, by the way, in Moscow today utilized the chance for an informal meeting to make up for the missed meeting in the Federal Republic, at least by a little bit. After all, Geneva also involves the security of the two German states. This is why it is of central European interest to take the offensive missile already existing and constituting a threat more seriously than the weapons on which research is still in progress. It is a fact, however, that it was the latter, the nonnuclear defensive weapons in outer space, which caused the Soviet Union to negotiate on its terrestrial missile superiority.

Because this is true it defies any political logic -- and this, ladies and gentlemen, has been stated here several times before -- to demand at the beginning of negotiations that research on Reagan's space weapons be halted, as the SPD has done again today. No poker player will exchange his four aces against two sevens, believing that he could nevertheless win the game that way.

Press Review

DW131055 Cologne Duetschlandfunk Network in German GMT 13 Mar 85

[From the press review]

[Text] Several editorials discuss the disarmament dialogue between the two superpowers that was resumed yesterday in Geneva.

HANNOVERSCHE ALLGEMEINE writes: The fact that the first meeting of the large delegation was not accompanied by the usual fireworks of mutual accusations may awaken slight hopes.

However, you should not foster the illusion that from this peaceful meeting a clear path will lead to a positive result. The rivalry between the two powers and the wish to make the other party appear in a bad light, will demand their tribute in due time, says the paper.

AUGSBURGER ALLGEMEINE notes: Every agreement in Geneva presupposes that the Americans and the Soviets will abandon the utopia that absolute protection against a potential enemy could exist for their countries. The one who looks hypnotized at equal security, is thinking in military categories, and he believes that counting missiles is already a policy. Without a minimum of confidence, without cooperative security, Geneva will not open up new prospects. All those involved probably agree that if they do not succeed in stopping the armament spiral now, they never will.

RUHR-NACHRICHTEN of Dortmund maintains: It is already a fact today that the struggle will be long and hard. Therefore, hopes for quick agreements and results are premature. The question is still open whether in view of the expected difficulties in the field of space weapons, partial agreements on the level of intermediate-range or intercontinental weapons will be possible if talks will stop or even fail in another field of negotiations. According to assurances from Washington and Moscow, there is no lack of good will on the part of the superpowers to achieve verifiable results in Geneva.

BRAUNSCHWEIGER ZEITUNG writes: The fact that the U.S.-Soviet disarmament negotiations have begun at the agreed time in Geneva despite the death of party and state chief Chernenko, indicated two things, namely that this is already Gorbachev's conference. He has, as delegation chief Karpov stated for good reason and not out of sheer eloquence, presided over the Politburo session where the guidelines for Geneva were stipulated. Second, the new man will act. He wants to overcome the short and dull era of his predecessor as quickly as possible, and he wants to personally impress the epoch that lies before him, states the paper.

CSO: 5200/2551

7 May 85

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

FRG EX-MINISTER VIEWS U.S., SOVIET STANCES ON TALKS

LD281614 Hamburg DPA in German 1311 GMT 28 Mar 85

[Text] Bonn, 28 Mar (DPA)--Following talks with leading U.S. and Soviet politicians, former Research Minister Andreas von Buelow (SPD) is "greatly concerned" that the Geneva disarmament negotiations will be unsuccessful because of a lack of readiness to compromise, especially on the American side. Von Buelow met new party leader Mikhail Gorbachev in Moscow and U.S. Vice President George Bush in Washington when, as chairman of the SPD Party Executive's Security Police Commission, he was in a delegation of the Socialist International.

Von Buelow told newsmen in Bonn today that it would be absurd for the Europeans to support the U.S. "madness" of using the roundabout path of the research program for a defense system in space to achieve disarmament agreements. Following the talks in Moscow, he had the impression that results could also be achieved without using space arms.

Von Buelow said that in the 90-minute talk Gorbachev complained that the United States has taken no steps to improve the frosty climate between the two superpowers. Washington and the U.S. media are creating a mood opposed to the Geneva negotiations. Gorbachev described the situation, in view of the continuing arms race, as dangerous and possibly even explosive, and gave assurance that Moscow is prepared for comprehensive renunciation of force and for a balance of forces at a low level.

Von Buelow said that in Washington, where the delegation spoke with Secretary of State George Shultz and disarmament expert Paul Nitze, as well as Bush, the readiness for far-reaching disarmament agreements was stressed "with almost religious fervor." The American politicians stressed that in the interests of having a credible negotiating position, the United States must catch up with Moscow in many areas. Von Buelow doubted that the Americans will agree to real compromises which take into consideration the Soviet Union's special geostrategic position. He was therefore skeptical about whether results were at all possible in Geneva.

CSO: 5200/2551

7 May 85

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

GDR EXAMINES 'CONSEQUENCES' OF CONGRESS MX VOTE

LD282228 East Berlin Voice of GDR Domestic Service in German 1605 GMT 27 Mar 85

[Text] The U.S. House of Representatives today voted by a narrow majority in favor of the Reagan Administration's demand for the release of \$1.5 billion for constructing a further 21 MX intercontinental missiles. The senate reached its decision last week. Horst Kaeubler goes into the consequences of this vote.

[Kaeubler] Reagan calls the decision in congress an unmistakable signal of U.S. unity and cohesion. On what does the U.S. President base his judgment? Uninterruptedly the head of the White House has been ringing up one representative after another to make sure that MX gets through congress. American television called type of gentle persuasion--purely and simply--pressure, hardly ever exerted in so massive a form. And the unity and cohesion demonstrated in the voting is more debatable than ever. It was only by the narrow majority of 219 to 213 that the House of Representatives gave its approval to the MX program. Among the votes against there were even 24 Republicans, men of Reagan's own party. And the result of the vote in the senate also hardly reflects unity or cohesion. There, 55 senators voted in favor, and 45 against MX.

The president has recorded a dubious victory. All the same, this vote means the green light for a mammoth project for American nuclear armaments. Forty-two of the total 100 intercontinental missiles of the latest type, each equipped with 10 independently targetable multiple nuclear warheads, will now go into series production. The American president said he is pleased that a majority in congress grasped that protecting peace and a secure and more stable future must begin with a strong America. Who, listeners, can follow this logic? More and more prominent Americans in their own country are urging on the president to be cautious, to rethink to adopt a negotiating strategy not dictated by military swaggering. Behind this there is not only the fear that the gigantic arms expenditure could bring about a deficit crisis of enormous proportions. No, the anxiety is increasing that the American nuclear arms programs are being carried through at speed before the Geneva negotiations have really begun at all. In the NEW YORK TIMES, Archibald Gillies, president of the prestigious World Policy Institute in New York asked President Reagan: If it is our goal, as the administration maintains, to prevent a nuclear war, why does the administration want to spend \$20 billion this year on constructing destabilizing first-strike weapons like the MX, Trident and Pershing II, which do not promise a more stable future but increase the probability of war? The Soviet Union has gone into the Geneva

negotiations with the position of greater security through fewer weapons, and it has underpinned this position in the run-up to the negotiations with innumerable proposals--from a nuclear weapons freeze, through the renunciation of force, to a stop on the stationing of space weapons--as a sign of good will. Would this not be the time for Washington to adopt a negotiating policy which drops everything in order--despite differences in Soviet-American relations--to secure a success at the Geneva negotiations?

CSO:5200/3034

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

GDR COMMENTARY ON WESTERN REACTIONS TO GENEVA TALK ISSUES

ADN Views SDI, Freeze Plan

LD291552 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 0259 GMT 29 Mar 85

[By ADN correspondent Guenter Geidel: "Significant Soviet Steps Toward Disarmament"]

[Text] Brussels, 29 March (ADN)--In various circles of public opinion here in Belgium, as in the Netherlands, Luxembourg and France, a great deal of attention is currently focused on the question of how militarization of space can be prevented, after the increase in the arms race on earth. The predominant, widespread view is that, apart from the enormous dangers, involved in the preparation for a star war, militarization of space would make it impossible to achieve an agreement to reduce and limit nuclear strategic and medium-range weapons on earth. The latest remarks made by representatives of the United States in Western Europe, that the Soviet Union is also conducting research work into the construction of space weapons, are regarded here as only a maneuver to create a pretext in public opinion for the Pentagon's armaments plans.

In this connection numerous discussions are in progress here in the Belgian capital, where many West European authorities are headquartered. Well-informed sources in Brussels are saying that the Soviet Union recently submitted proposals in Geneva for a solution to the existing problems. It is said to be a decisive step toward arms limitation and disarmament.

One hears here that it concerns proposals for an agreement containing reciprocal measures that should be valid for the entire duration of the Geneva negotiations. In detail, it is said to concern a moratorium on the creation (including scientific and technical research work), testing, and deployment of offensive space weapons. It also includes a proposal to freeze USSR and U.S. strategic offensive weapons at their present quantitative level with regard to both the number of nuclear warheads and of carriers.

There is also talk of a third proposal, to halt deployment of American medium-range missiles in Europe and at the same time to halt further-reaching Soviet countermeasures.

One also hears here in Brussels that these proposals, which could be set out in a relevant USSR-U.S. joint document, would fully accord with the spirit of the Shultz-Gromyko agreement on the start of the negotiations.

The always well-informed circles in the Belgian capital say that there is great interest in the U.S. representatives' reaction to these far-reaching proposals. A positive response to them would undoubtedly be a good starting point for successful negotiations in Geneva and would create a more favorable atmosphere for the continuation of these negotiations.

GDR Radio on Freeze Plan

DW011159 East Berlin Domestic Service in German 1000 GMT 1 Apr 85

[Guenter Geidel dispatch]

[Text] The information contained in an ADN dispatch last week with reference to well-informed Brussels quarters, according to which the Soviet Union recently submitted in Geneva proposals that represent a truly decisive step toward arms limitation and disarmament, has met with a clear affirmation in political quarters of other states. The international reaction to the information from Geneva is being watched with interest in the Belgian capital. In this context, we will now read the following dispatch from Brussels by Guenter Geidel:

It is also indicative of weight of the state of facts reported by the ADN correspondent that its publication by NEUES DEUTSCHLAND on Friday was reprinted in detail over the weekend by news agencies and newspapers of various countries.

Thus, the British news agency REUTER stated that a report was published in the GDR according to which at its talks with the United States in Geneva, Moscow has submitted a bundle of proposals, including a halt to nuclear missiles and a ban on research work to develop space weapons. The dispatch from Brussels published by NEUES DEUTSCHLAND says with reference to well-informed sources that Moscow is now waiting for the U.S. reaction to its proposals. Neither the United States nor the Soviet Union had reported on the submission of proposals since the opening of the talks on 12 March, REUTER writes, but the report from Brussels reveal that Moscow has already taken such a step.

Specifically, REUTER reports these proposals as follows: A moratorium on the creation of offensive space weapons, including scientific-technical research work, testing and deployment; a freeze of strategic nuclear weapons at their present quantitative level with respect to the number of both the nuclear munitions as well as the means of delivery; a halt to the deployment of U.S. intermediate-range missiles and the simultaneous discontinuation of Soviet counter-measures. The REUTER report continues: The Soviet Union demands that all three measures apply for the duration of the Geneva talks. It says that in a speech on the occasion of his appointment as head of the CPSU on 11 March, Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev declared that Moscow aims at a freeze on nuclear weapons and the discontinuation of the development of space weapons.

NEUES DEUTSCHLAND, REUTER says noted with reference to its sources that the Soviet proposals constitute a decisive step in direction of arms limitation and disarmament. A positive reaction of the United States would be a good starting point for the Geneva talks and would create a favorable climate for rapid progress.

A report by the Austrian news agency APA also deals in detail with the information that was obtainable from ADN here in Brussels. The APA report is headed: GDR Publishes USSR Proposals--Moratorium on Space Weapons and Freeze of the Nuclear Missiles. APA restates the three proposals that were heard in the Belgian capital. The Austrian news agency stresses the passage in the dispatch according to which these initiatives reportedly are a creditably decisive step in direction of arms limitation and disarmament and that a positive reaction of the United States would be a good beginning for the talks and would create a climate favorable for rapid progress. According to Gorbachev, the USSR aims at achieving a freeze on nuclear weapons and a halt to the development of space weapons.

The British paper THE GUARDIAN also refers to the report on details about the Geneva talks that have leaked out, as the paper puts it. This paper, also reports on the information about the USSR proposals published in NEUES DEUTSCHLAND.

Quarters in the Belgian capital continue to look forward with great interest to the reaction of U.S. representatives to the far-reaching Soviet proposals. Observers here have reaffirmed their stance that it would be highly significant for successful negotiations in Geneva and for a favorable climate serving this end if this initiative found a positive response on the part of the United States.

CSO: 5200/3033

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

LEUSCHNER VIEWS ARMS ISSUES, EC EXPANSION

DW020633 East Berlin Domestic Service in German 1700 GMT 1 Apr 85

[Gunter Leuschner's weekly international review]

[Text] It is normal for negotiations such as those between the Soviet Union and the United States in Geneva to be confidential. The public hears little or nothing about the content of the talks. However, it is also normal for some fact or another to leak out. Last Friday, the ADN correspondent learned from well-informed sources in the Belgian capital that the Soviet Union had submitted three proposals which are so logical and so consistent with Soviet policy that we can assume, even without official confirmation, that this information is reliable.

The Soviet Union reportedly submitted a proposal for an agreement on an moratorium on the research, testing, and deployment of offensive weapons in space. Second, the Soviet Union reportedly proposed a freeze on both sides' strategic weapons at their present level. Third, there is talk about discontinuing deployment of intermediate-range weapons, which would involve the U.S. Pershing and cruise missiles as well as the Soviet Union's countermeasures. Both sides--the Soviet Union and the United States--should agree in a joint document to stay with these three measures as long as the Geneva negotiations last.

In my view, these proposals are extremely important and are aimed at avoiding creating additional difficulties during the probably long negotiations on the three issues under discussion in Geneva. Such difficulties could only be expected if the arms race were to continue during the talks. Since both sides want to reduce the number of strategic and intermediate-range weapons and to prevent an arms race in space from the beginning it would make sense to freeze these weapons at the present level.

At any rate, it is not logical for the United States to negotiate in Geneva on the reduction of strategic weapons, while congress is virtually being forced by the administration to decide in favor of building an additional 21 new strategic missiles equipped with 10 warheads each. The United States could easily do without these 210 additional warheads if it really wanted to reduce the present number.

Negotiating in Geneva would [be] easier if agreement were reached on such moratoriums. Such demands have been raised by the public in the West for a long

time, and, prior to the Geneva negotiations, the Soviet Union suggested such confidence-building measures--at Andrey Gromyko's television press conference on 13 January, for example. This also shows that the political sources in Brussels quoted in the ADN report are really well informed.

As always in such cases, everything naturally depends on whether the other side--the United States--will also join this type of confidence-building measure. So far, we have no information in this respect. However, given the waves of indignation inundating the United States as a result of its plans to militarize space, Washington should be particularly interested in a moratorium on space weapons because this would calm the troubled waters and dispel doubts about the readiness of the United States to negotiate in Geneva.

In fact, it is becoming increasingly obvious that since the time the atomic bomb was produced, the United States has never faced as much opposition as it is now in connection with its new space weapons project. In the past few days alone, the Australian Government, the Danish Parliament, Sweden's prime minister, and U.S. experts have rejected these plans. In addition, the forthcoming Easter marches in a number of West European countries will confirm this clear veto. Moreover, a sort of disillusionment is apparently spreading even among these West European political circles who several weeks ago were halfway or almost totally ready to give their approval.

This may be partly attributable to Secretary Weinberger's ultimatum. Last week, Weinberger called on the NATO partners to make a decision within 60 days. Vogel, chairman of the SPD Bundestag faction, said that this was how you treated vassals, not allies, and CDU circles have expressed similar opinions. So, this behavior has created indignation. It speaks volumes, but presumably is the reason behind what Western newspapers have described as a change of mood that irritates the Americans and that the United States wants to stop before it gets out of control.

Opinion polls such as the one conducted by the Godesberg Institute, in which nearly 80 percent of the FRG citizens reject the claim that space weapons would reduce the danger of war, may also have contributed to strengthening the new doubts. The fact that the Federal Government is keeping its option open regarding participation in the U.S. plans, that Foreign Minister Genscher has expressly stated that it is the task of Geneva to pursue preventive arms control by preventing space weapons, and that politicians in Great Britain, France, the FRG, and Italy are almost simultaneously voicing reservations--this fact is remarkable and obviously irritates Washington.

Hamburg's MORGENPOST writes today that by exerting pressure on the West European NATO states regarding the militarization of space, Reagan wants to kill two birds with one stone. First the Americans would not have to pay for the expensive development alone; second, the participants would have to share the responsibility. This is exactly what is causing a growing number of West European politicians to have so many reservations.

We believe in this case that it would be a good thing if the Soviet proposal on a moratorium on any militarization of space, including research, were to meet with broad support even by these circles for as long as the Geneva negotiations last.

Dear listeners, following 8 years of negotiations, Spain's and Portugal's EC membership is apparently complete. These 8 years of negotiations, as well as the compromises and agreement reached at the last minute, lessened the importance of the news being spread about the success of the event. The pleasure of old and the two new EC members seems to be limited. These involved are probably aware that the decision over the weekend has not resolved any of the economic and political problems.

For many years, Spain and Portugal were faced with a dilemma. If they had not joined the EC, their economies would have been affected by the protectionism of this club of 10, while joining the EC would mean a financial burden, increase the pressure of competition, and have advantages that would be difficult to assess. These countries' governments chose the apparently lesser of two evils.

As for the EC, the acceptance of the two countries as members also represented a two-edged sword. On the one hand, West Europe's economic and political significance would increase at the expense of its overseas competitions--an attractive prospect in view of the U.S. hegemonial aspirations; on the other, the EC members were well aware that Spain's and Portugal's membership would be bound to intensify the conflicts within the community. Thus, an agreement was finally reached that does not fully satisfy anyone and created new problems without resolving the old ones, but that also--and this is the hope expressed--will help guarantee Spain's NATO membership. For some people, this may have been the main purpose for all this negotiating and bargaining over compromises and temporary solutions. Thus, this West Europe of 12 represents a success with a considerable number of flaws.

CSO: 5200/3034

SPACE ARMS

SOVIET COMMENT ON ALLIED ATTITUDES TO SDI

Howe Voices Doubts

PM191701 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Mar 85 Second Edition p 4

[Report by A. Maslennikov, PRAVDA correspondent: "Growing Concern"]

[Text] London, 16 Mar -- Speaking yesterday at the Royal Institute of Defence Studies, Foreign Secretary G. Howe said that the Western allies must carefully analyze all aspects of the proposed U.S. concept before expressing unconditional support for it. Having expounded the British Government's well-known viewpoint on the research part of the program, Howe saw fit to issue the warning that the actual commencement of research may have unpredictable consequences.

The creation of an ABM system, G. Howe said, poses a whole series of complex technical, strategic, and military-political problems. Among scientists and politicians, he noted, there is no certainty that this system is at all capable of attaining the goals that have been set for it. "We all admit," he said, "that there would be no sense in creating a new 'Maginot line of the 21st century' liable to be outflanked by relatively simpler and considerably cheaper countermeasures."

But there is more to it than that, Howe continued. "At all stages we must not lose sight of the key issue: Will this new development not undermine the existing system of deterrence?... We must constantly be thinking how best to ensure the effectiveness of deterrence, and to limit rather than stimulate a further arms race."

From this viewpoint, Howe said, the "star wars" concept poses the "inevitable risk of a radical revision of the current foundations of Western security." It may result in an abrupt destabilization of the international situation, a new acceleration of the arms race, the appearance of dangerous uncertainty in international relations, and the growth of the threat of nuclear war."

Assessing G. Howe's pronouncements, the local paper THE FINANCIAL TIMES notes that they "reflect the government's growing concern in connection with President Reagan's attempts to implement his strategic defense initiative." Citing official British Foreign Office spokesmen, commentators note that G. Howe's speech is the fullest and most detailed account of London's official policy on this issue. "The tone of the speech," the diplomatic correspondent of THE DAILY TELEGRAPH writes, was prompted by fears that the U.S. Administration's enthusiasm for space defense could undermine prospects for agreements at the Geneva talks."

Reagan 'Indignant' at Howe's Stand

LD220024 Moscow TASS in English 2220 GMT 21 Mar 85

[Text] Moscow March 21 TASS--British Foreign Secretary Geoffrey Howe recently came out with the criticism of the U.S. programme of "star wars." He stressed that it might place the world before the prospect of the arms race on an unprecedented scale, IZVESTIYA correspondent in London Vladimir Skosyrev writes today.

Hardly a few days passed since then as Washington launched a campaign of pressure on London to force it to follow obediently in the wake of the United States strategy, the correspondent writes. U.S. Ambassador to Great Britain Charles Price visited the Foreign Office on 20 March and raised the question of Geoffrey Howe's statement.

According to GUARDIAN, the ambassador made it plain to the British side that President Reagan was highly indignant at the attitude toward the "Strategic Defence Initiative" expressed by the British foreign secretary in his speech.

Washington's attacks on its partner in NATO did not pass unnoticed by the British public, IZVESTIYA's correspondent writes. Several prominent scientists and politicians sent letters to TIMES. In their letters they stress that the British Government should conduct an independent line despite overt U.S. pressure.

Perle Also Critical

LD211156 Moscow TASS in English 1143 GMT 21 Mar 85

[Text] London March 21 TASS -- The United States is increasing pressure to bear on its West European allies, seeking from them unreserved support for the adventurist plans for a militarization of outer space. This has been most convincingly demonstrated by the address by Richard Perle, U.S. deputy defence secretary, to the conference on problems of communism and liberal democracy called in the British capital. The statement by Richard Perle caused broad political repercussions.

Thus the Washington emissary lashed out, in particular, against Geoffrey Howe, British foreign secretary, for the expression by the latter in one of his recent statements, albeit in a quite restrained form, as regards the advisability of Washington's "star wars" programme. The U.S. deputy defence secretary criticized the British foreign secretary for "distorting" the development of strategic relations between the USA and the Soviet Union throughout the past decade. According to Perle, Geoffrey Howe distorted in his speech the history of Soviet-American relations beyond recognition.

It is by no means fortuitous that the U.S. deputy defence secretary has chosen one of the West European capitals for expressing such reproaches. As the newspaper FINANCIAL TIMES points out, they in Washington are more concerned over the apprehensions openly expressed by the Europeans as regards the "star wars" programme than they wish to recognize it officially. In public, the newspaper writes, the U.S. Administration is trying to belittle manifestations of disagreement with its West European partners in the hope of preserving at least semblance of their appearance in a united front with the USA. Yet, privately, American officials declare that they are dissatisfied with the stand of the West European countries on that issue.

The local press also stresses that soon after the statement by Richard Perle, Geoffrey Howe met with Charles Price, U.S. ambassador to London. In the opinion of newspapers, the ambassador expressed to the foreign secretary his "perplexity" over the latter's public statement on the "star wars" problem.

Washington March 21 TASS -- British officials say that they do not remember another instance of an official in Perle's rank reprimanding a British foreign secretary, a correspondent of THE WASHINGTON POST in London writes. The statement by Geoffrey Howe, which was a cause of much concern for the Reagan administration, and Perle's answer are assessed by some diplomats as evidence that it will be difficult to overcome differences on the "star wars" problem.

Dumas Criticizes SDI

LD232340 Moscow TASS in English 1608 GMT 23 Mar 85

[Text] Helsinki March 23 TASS--President Reagan's "strategic French defence initiative" is aimed at disrupting the existing balance of forces. French Minister of External Relations Roland Dumas said this at a press conference here. He said that the "strategic defence initiative" is fraught with the heightening of war danger and possibility of unpredictable developments. R. Dumas pointed out that alongside the development of this initiative, the United States continues building up all types of its armaments which refutes the assertions that the program allegedly leads to arms reduction. In this connection the minister emphasized the need of immediate prevention of the militarization of space.

Canadians Alarmed at NORAD Link

LD251125 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0330 GMT 25 Mar 85

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Nikolay Agayants]

[Text] There is serious alarm on the other side of the Atlantic. I have in mind the United State's northern neighbor, Canada. Many people who live in the maple leaf country regard the agreement on the so-called modernization within the NORAD [North American Defense] framework, recently concluded in Quebec, as yet another step along the path of involving Canada in the Pentagon's plans for star wars preparations.

The 52 new microwave radar stations, due to be built in Canada's Arctic regions over the next few years, replacing the obsolete early warning Dewline [Distant Early Warning] system, are undoubtedly merely a link within the general chain of the Pentagon's space escapades.

After all, it is not for nothing that [U.S. Secretary of Defence] Weinberger, speaking after the conclusion of the Canadian-American talks in Quebec, stated without hesitation that, and I quote, antimissile forward-based arms can be deployed in Canada, the United States, and at sea. This admission gave rise to an explosion of indignation in the maple leaf country, since it runs counter to the NORAD Treaty, which states outright that Canada will never participate in the American antimissile defense system and that the treaty was signed for the sake of joint air defense.

Alas, times and mores change and, as we can see, the spirit and the letter of agreements foisted by Washington upon its partners to the accompaniment of verbiage about the mythical communist threat also change.

Weinberger Seeks Allied Support

LD241027 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0330 GMT 24 Mar 85

[Text] According to news agency reports, U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger sets out on a European tour today. He will visit Luxembourg where he will take part in the 2-day NATO defense ministers meeting, and later, while in Paris, will have talks with President Mitterrand and Defense Minister Hernu. The trip's basic aim is to garner support from the NATO bloc partners for Reagan's notorious Strategic Defense Initiative, which envisages the creation of a wide-scale antimissile defense system with space-based elements.

In this connection the UPI news agency notes that many of America's European allies are now expressing grave misgivings over the star wars plans. These doubts are explained by two considerations. In the first place, there is fear that the Soviet-U.S. talks may break off if the United States refuses to discuss the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative. A breaking off of the talks will inevitably lead to an intensification of the arms race, in particular in space. Secondly, concern is also being aroused by the star wars plans itself, since senior U.S. figures and specialists who were given the task of convincing the Europeans of its advisability were unable to do so.

Now, as we see, the heavy artillery has been brought out: The defense secretary is coming to Europe in an attempt to explain the Reagan program.

Attempts at Persuasion

LD232038 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 23 Mar 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video talk by political observer Georgiy Zubkov]

[Text] Hello, comrades! A competition has been announced in Washington to find the person who can think up the most successful, reassuring, and soothing name for the Strategic Defense Initiative. Two years have passed to the day since President Reagan announced this initiative. It has come to be firmly defined as "star wars," and not "protection from nuclear weapons." Two years have passed, and things are being put on a practical footing: Funds are being allocated, teams of scientists are being put together, and work plans and schedules are being drawn up.

However, not everything is going as smoothly as those who came up with the initiative would like. People are making objections to them and arguing with them, and there is disagreement in Washington itself and in the capitals of Western Europe. The allies are skeptical of the star wars program and are accepting it with reservations, so all the stops have to be pulled out, from a competition for a new name for the initiative to visits to their intractable partners.

A group of high-ranking U.S. officials is already traveling about the West European capitals, from Copenhagen to Oslo, and from Oslo to Bonn, The Hague, and Madrid. Officially, it is called "an explanation of the space strategy of the White House", but essentially it is plain and simple pressure, which has entered the practice of U.S. diplomacy.

On Sunday, too, U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger will set off for Western Europe with the same aims. First, he will meet the NATO defense ministers in Luxembourg, and then he will go to Paris for 3 days. The U.S. Administration envisages that the talks with President Mitterrand and Defense Minister Hernu will not be simple; the Pentagon chief has to get France's official recognition of Reagan's star wars designs.

There is much talk of the moral categories of the plan, but no, it is an immoral one. It is immoral because it will not decrease the threat of war, but increase it; it will lead not to a decrease in the level of arms, but to an increase. They assert that it is just scientific research, but who can believe that? Why load a weapon if you have no intention of firing it? They speak expansively about a "fresh stimulus for arms control," but once again these are lies. The Reagan initiative does not strengthen the antimissile defense treaty; it undermines it. It is not fortuitous that in Paris, London, and Bonn there is concern over the fact that the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative may damage the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva. Yes, their success, the results achieved, depend first and foremost on whether both sides strictly adhere to the agreement reached on the subject and aims of the talks. This was stated once again during yesterday's meeting in the Kremlin with representatives of the Socialist International. The Soviet Union wants the arms race on earth to end. The Soviet Union wants the arms race in space to be prevented.

'Growing Doubts' in Europe

LD261809 Moscow International Service in Italian 1600 GMT 25 Mar 85

[Commentary by Viktor Shlenov]

[Text] A mission from Washington is now in Western Europe comprising five high-ranking officials of the administration. REUTER has reported that the mission's objective is to dispel the growing skepticism among the peoples of Europe regarding President Reagan's strategic defense initiative (SDI). Our commentator Viktor Shlenov writes:

Washington is giving great advertising to the SDI project, which in effect is a program for militarizing space. The claim by the advocates for transforming space into a nuclear arsenal and a venue for possible star wars finds little support in the Old World. Even among the leaders in Britain and the Federal Republic of Germany, the United States' main allies in Europe, doubts are growing as to the utility of the U.S. space plan.

At the same time, the overwhelming majority of European public opinion is unanimous: Implementing the American plans destabilizes the situation in the world and torpedoes universal security.

The fact is that the side that does not yet have space weapons will have serious reasons for assuming that the other side intends to launch the first strike. These fears are even more well founded in light of the fact that along with preparations for the arms race in space, the U.S. administration is continuing to accumulate new types of offensive strategic weapons, in particular, the new MX intercontinental missiles.

The implementation of the so-called space defense plan will increase the nuclear threat to the Soviet Union and its allies, who will find themselves compelled to suitably respond.

It is consequently difficult not to agree with Charles Hernu, the French defense minister, that implementing the American defensive system will lead to a further twist in the offensive weapons race.

The Americans are seeking to reduce the West Europeans to swallow a bait that [words indistinct]. During a recent visit to Western Europe, U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger stated that the space umbrella could cover not only the United States, but also Europe. Here, however, is the opinion of the experts of the International Institute of Strategic Studies in London: The American shield will be powerless against cruise missiles and weapons systems operating within the earth's atmosphere.

Consequently, it is not strange that the suspicion is spreading throughout Western Europe that by covering itself with its space shield, Washington intends to expose the countries of Western Europe to a retaliatory strike. Such is the cynical philosophy of the American space monsters.

Further on Visits

LD261219 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 25 Mar 85

[From the "World Today" program presented by Vsevolod Shishkovskiy]

[Text] The Reagan administration is insistently trying to involve its West European allies in implementing its dangerous plans to militarize space. That is the aim of the trip to Europe just begun by U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger. He will visit Luxembourg, where he will take part in a 2-day meeting of NATO defense ministers, and during a 3-day sojourn in Paris will have talks with France's President Mitterrand and Defense Minister Hernu.

The U.S. press points out that the head of the war department intends to seek support from his NATO partners for Reagan's strategic defense initiative [SDI], which envisages the creation of a large-scale antimissile defense system with space-based elements. In the opinion of observers, Weinberger intends to pay special attention to pressuring France in order to force a public statement from it at least agreeing with Reagan's star wars plans. UPI notes in this connection that of the allies of the United States, France has expressed the most serious reservations about the SDI.

At the same time as Weinberger's visit, a group of highly placed U.S. officials is also traveling to West European capitals. Having visited Denmark and Norway, they intend to sell the SDI in the FRG, the Netherlands, and Spain this week. REUTER notes that this trip is occasioned by the ever more skeptical attitude of West Europeans to the idea of Washington's star wars. Following France and Britain, doubts about the usefulness of such a program have been expressed for the first time by West German Chancellor Kohl.

As we can see, even among the United States' closest allies, understanding of the fact is growing that the course taken by Washington may not just scotch the Soviet-American dialogue that has begun in Geneva, but also entail a new arms race that could spread into space.

Japanese Research Plan Hit

LD212055 Moscow TASS in English 1940 GMT 21 Mar 85

["Japan: Dangerous Plans"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow March 21 TASS -- TASS news analyst Leonid Ponomarev writes:

Japan intends to start its own research in the sphere of preparations for "star wars". As is clear from a KYODO TSUSHIN report, Prime Minister of Japan Nakasone, speaking at the budget commission of the House of Councillors on Wednesday, said that Japan should consider the efficiency of such a programme scientifically and strategically. According to the news agency, the prime minister's pronouncement gave rise to disapproval of many members of oppositional parties who believe that the Reagan "Strategic Defence Initiative", which envisages the formation of an anti-missile defence system with space-based elements, will spread the arms race to outer space.

This opinion is shared by many public leaders and politicians, scientists in the United States itself, Japan and many other countries. The Soviet Union invariably stresses that no reference to "defensive character" or "mere scientific research" can camouflage the aggressive essence of the American "star wars" programme, Washington's intentions to turn "technological advantage" over the USSR, which it seems to it that it has, into military superiority.

Way back in January this year the Japanese Government already declared in support of the Reagan "star wars" programme and now openly declares the readiness to draw Japan to work in the use of near-earth and outer space in military purposes. Used for the purpose is repeatedly tested tactics of "creeping infiltration" which is used by the government for a steady rise in Japan's military budget, for the build up of military might, in attempts of some forces to renunciate the "three non-nuclear principles". Referring to "the needs of defence" and "obligations" to the United States, the Tokyo leaders steadily seek to accustom the public of the country and the whole world to the thought that Tokyo's military machine at the present-day stage should meet the requirements of the nuclear and space age.

It is exactly in this light that one should consider creation in Japan of advanced military technology, the Japanese Government's readiness to hand over part of the components of that technology to the Pentagon for militarisation of near-earth space, and also the use, seemingly modest, of "Sakura-2" communication satellites by the Japan Defence Agency that began last week. The press of Japan overtly points out that the Japan Defence Agency intends to "spread defence" to sea lanes of 1,000 nautical miles from the Japanese coast. As we see, electronic-space components are introduced into that "defence".

The crawling of Japan into the space arms race does not bid anything good above all to Japan itself. As is shown by the experience of all post-war years, the build up of armaments in the globe does not make peace and security of peoples stronger. Japan has grievous experience of having been victim of American atomic bombings. Some people in Japan seemingly would like to cross out that experience.

Israeli Participation Criticized

LD271824 Moscow TASS in English 1507 GMT 27 Mar 85

[Text] Moscow March 27 TASS---TASS political news analyst Leonid Ponomarev writes:

The Reagan administration has officially extended an invitation to Israel to take part in the "star wars" preparations programme. A statement of this effect was made by Caspar Weinberger, U.S. secretary of defence, at a meeting of the NATO Nuclear Planning Group in Luxembourg. Washington's proposal signals a further deepening and broadening of U.S.-Israeli "strategic partnership" aimed at forcing on the Arab countries American-Israeli military rule, strengthening and broadening U.S. military presence in the Middle East.

In building up Israel's military power, the United States does not stint aid to its partner, above all military aid. Over the past 20 years Washington has granted Tel Aviv 21 billion dollars for military purposes alone, including the funding of the Israeli interventions against the Arab countries. The Pentagon lavishly supplies Israel with the latest military equipment, including "F-16" planes, M-1 tanks, airbombs, shells and mines. The United States provides [word indistinct] percent of the funds to Israel for the development of multipurpose "Lavi" fighter bomber. Last year, for example, more than 400 million dollars from the more than a billion dollars worth of American military aid to Israel was spent on work to design that plane.

The American invitation extended to Israel to participate in the "star wars" shows that in relations with Tel Aviv the United States continues laying its main emphasis on military cooperation which is the main tool in the foreign policy of both countries. It is obvious that drawing (?Israel) into participation in militarisation of outer space is totally unnecessary, since, as the world public knows, no Arab or other country in the world is going to attack Israel, much less from outer space. Washington and Tel Aviv need the proposed American-Israeli cooperation in the "star wars" programme in order to continue their joint aggressive policy. To achieve their aim they do not stop even at using outer space as a theatre of military operations.

CSO: 5200/1057

7 May 85

SPACE ARMS

FRG HIT FOR BACKING U.S. ON SDI DESPITE PUBLIC OPINION

PM111032 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Apr 85 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Yu. Yakhontov dispatch: "The Direction in Which the FRG Is Drifting"]

[Text] Official Bonn found itself facing an urgent problem in the last week of March. A directive couched in the form of an "invitation" arrived from Washington, asking it to take part in the development of the U.S. so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" [SDI], better known as the "star wars" program.

The form in which the invitation -- addressed to all the United States' NATO allies and also to Japan, Australia, and Israel -- was couched initially caused irritation in Bonn. But it was only the form, not the substance. U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger, used to moving among the military, who are not too well versed in drawing-room subtleties, obviously forgot that he was dealing with allies and not enemies and gave them 60 days to deliberate, having, it is true, reassured them that no sanctions at all would be applied against those who refused.

Nevertheless, people on the Rhine are not used to harboring grudges against their transatlantic partner's hegemonist escapades for too long. People here were happy to accept the American side's indirect apologies for the "unfortunate" formulation of the defense secretary's letter, and black limousines with police motorcycle escorts started flashing along the West German capital's streets. Washington's emissaries arrived in Bonn in the persons of General Abrahamson, in charge of the "star wars" program, State Department representatives, and other officials. They had been assigned the task of conditioning West German public opinion to ensure that -- heaven forbid! -- nothing misfires. It is, after all, well known that there are quite a few opponents of Bonn joining this military-space "pool" even within the ranks of the ruling Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union-Free Democratic Party ruling coalition, let alone the opposition -- the Social Democrats, Communists, "Greens," and participants in the entire antiwar movement.

It was not accident, people here believe, that the Americans timed the operation to impose the space weapons program on their allies to coincide with the start of the Geneva talks between the USSR and the United States, whose goal is to elaborate effective agreements also on the prevention of an arms race in space.

The unpopularity of Reagan's "star wars" plan in the FRG is no secret to anybody. Realistic-minded people are perfectly aware of the dangers contained in this program not only for the West Germans themselves but also for mankind as a whole.

This is why broad circles of the FRG population, disturbed by the row that has arisen around the SDI, the continuing arms race, and the deployment of U.S. first-strike missiles on their territory, saw in the Geneva talks a real ray of hope, a hope that an accord on disarmament may be reached. Hopes have repeatedly been expressed here that progress -- if it were to be achieved in Geneva -- would undoubtedly have an impact on the overall climate of East-West mutual relations, which are definitely in need of sharp improvement.

Of course people are interested in what the FRG Government itself intends to do to help the successful outcome of the Soviet-American talks. Does it intend to play the role of a detached observer of events, expecting that the FRG would not be the loser in the event of success, or will it, without any hesitation, follow the zig-zags of the advocates of a "policy of strength" in the United States?

To put it briefly, there are many questions, all of them very important and topical, particularly in view of two diametrically opposed facts:

Fact number one. Resolutely objecting to the transformation of the talks into a kind of cover for further stepping up the arms race, the USSR has proposed the introduction of a moratorium on research into and development of any kind of space weapons, a freeze on the sides' nuclear arsenals, and a halt to the further deployment of medium-range missiles. The point at issue concerns both the new U.S. missiles in Europe and the USSR missile weapons installed within the framework of countermeasures.

Fact number two. By contrast, the United States marked the start of the Geneva talks by pushing through its legislative bodies new programs for the deployment of MX ballistic missiles with 10 warheads each and by loudly announcing the recruitment of "volunteers" from among its allies for a team which will undertake the preparation of an unprecedented round of the arms race in space. Under these circumstances, unquestionable importance attaches to what the FRG ruling circles will opt for and what stance they will take.

Let us begin with the fact that they have ordered their mass news media to keep completely silent about the above mentioned important Soviet initiative, as if it did not exist. Nevertheless, eminent politicians from the ruling coalition, whose reading is not limited to only newspapers, would find it somewhat awkward to claim ignorance of the USSR's proposals.

But they did manage to find a way out. As I was told by V. Ruehe, deputy chairman of the Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union [CDU/CSU] parliamentary faction, the FRG, you see, intends to go much further; it aims at total disarmament while the Soviet proposals in question are not so "comprehensive." It is as if people in Bonn have completely forgotten the USSR's repeatedly expressed readiness for really comprehensive disarmament. Furthermore, if we were to believe my interlocutor's words, acceptance of our proposals regarding a freeze on nuclear arsenals would mean, it appears, "encouragement of Soviet superiority."

To put it briefly, we see emerging before us the former stance based on the fabricated thesis of the USSR's superiority, a thesis which the CDU/CSU bloc exploited back in 1982 to push through the Bundestag the decision on the deployment of Pershing II and cruise missiles in the FRG.

On the very day Abrahamson embarked on his explanatory mission in Bonn, the Federal Government issued (what timing!) an official statement. Frankly speaking, this document, four pages of typewritten text, is so contradictory and so cleverly composed that, if your patience runs out before reading it through to the end, you might get a completely opposite impression of its orientation. While supporting the goals of the Geneva talks set out in the 8 January Soviet-American joint statement and paying lip service to the prevention of an arms race in space and the reduction and limitation of strategic weapons and medium-range nuclear missiles, the FRG Government at the same time readily shares R. Reagan's assurances regarding the supposedly defensive nature of his peace initiative. The statement claims that by undertaking the development of space weapons the United States is not, it transpires, pursuing the goal of achieving superiority.

You read this government document and you think: Has so much time passed since last November that people in Bonn have managed to forget the well-known passages in the U.S. President's election campaign speech in which he said without beating about the bush that he considers his main goal to be the achievement of U.S. "military and technological superiority" over the USSR? Or has this policy speech already been consigned to the archives?!

Many more differing claims contradicting repeated declarations that Bonn is against the militarization of space can be found in this statement. The only thing that is hitherto lacking is a direct announcement of the FRG's agreement to participate in the implementation of the U.S. program. A decision on this question has been put off for a few months.

People here ask themselves: Is this not just a matter of tactics? After all, if we were to lift the fog surrounding the formulations concerning the FRG's desire to "study" and consistently trace through the economic and technological aspects of the "Defense Initiative," if we were to read such conservative newspapers as, for example, FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE or DIE WELT, we would get the impression that the FRG public is being obviously brainwashed in favor of agreement. Now, on the eve of the 40th anniversary of the rout of Hitler's reich and the liberation from fascism and war, it would simply be inappropriate to announce the intention to join in a venture that is particularly militarist and very dangerous in its consequences, no matter how it may be presented to the public.

So, who can take seriously the talk that the FRG's participation in research on "star wars" technology does not at all mean that West German scientific and industrial potential is making its contribution to the development of fundamentally new weapons. By joining the "team" engaged in the development of weapons for "star wars" the FRG will find itself at a qualitatively new level in terms of its military-political status among the NATO allies. It would catch up with Britain and France, which possess their own nuclear potential to the envy of West German rightists.

As for the West German military-industrial complex and the country's militarist and revanchist circles, they have their own ax to grind: For a long time now the ban on the production of atomic, chemical, and bacteriological weapons has been making life difficult for them, giving them an inferiority complex. By becoming accomplices in the development of space weapons they will at long last be able to "walk tall" and put their finger on the launch button of ultramodern weapons on an equal basis with their North Atlantic bloc allies. The only point is, how is this to be reconciled with solemn assurances of love for peace?

Bonn's reassuring declarations of attachment to peace, disarmament, and peoples' security have been heard on many occasions over the last few months. Nevertheless, if you actually trace the various aspects of the direction in which the FRG is now drifting, you involuntarily conclude that this direction almost totally coincides with the guidelines which the United States has set for itself in gambling on achieving military superiority and unleashing an unrestrained arms race. This applies particularly to the question of participating in the U.S. President's space initiative.

This drift by the FRG today, 4 decades after the end of the bloodiest war in human history, cannot fail to cause suspicion. It is well known that people in European countries and, naturally, in the Soviet Union are paying close attention to the fact that a nuclear-missile war potential is being established on West German soil. This is also perceived here, in the FRG, by all who have not been deafened by the roll of propaganda drumbeats or blinded by the revanchist slogans and impudent outbursts of "resettlers" and "expelees."

It can often be heard here that for various reasons the FRG is interested in the further development of political, economic, scientific, technical, cultural, and other ties with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. Newspapers write about this, and political and public figures make speeches on the very same subject.

The Soviet Union, for its part, is also interested in an expansion of ties with the Federal Republic. But it must be born in mind that determining significance for the further development of relations with the USSR and the other socialist countries will attach to the policy which the FRG will follow on issues affecting the security interests of these states. Yet this key prerequisite for the successful development of mutually advantageous ties is sometimes forgotten on the Rhine.

CSO: 5200/1094

7 May 85

SPACE ARMS

HISTORY, PROSPECTS OF U.S. MILITARY SPACE PROGRAMS DISCUSSED

Editorial Introduction

Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 8, Feb 85 p 18

[Editorial Introduction to feature under the general headline "The 'Star Wars' Menace"]

[Text]

"The monstrous horrors of modern warfare have made people realize what forces modern technology has created, how these forces are wasted in awful and senseless war." When Lenin spoke these words the level of the world's productive forces was in no way comparable to the present. But already then every innovation, be it the internal combustion engine, high explosives or poison gases, first of all found its way into the hands of the military and was made a weapon of aggressive imperialist wars.

With the passage of years weaponry became ever more sophisticated and the arms buildup spiralled ever more steeply. And with each new type or system of armaments peace and security in the world became more and more fragile.

Today, through the fault of imperialism, above all

U.S. imperialism, humanity has been brought to the danger point. The arms buildup is on the verge of spilling over beyond the atmosphere. Hence the imperative need to take action to prevent the militarization of outer space. The efforts of the Soviet Union and its allies and proposals advanced by other countries are directed to this end. Washington, on the contrary, in the futile hope of gaining military superiority, has placed the emphasis on the development and production of "star wars" systems.

When did these U.S. plans for the military use of outer space originate? What are the implications of the space weapon systems being evolved on the other side of the Atlantic? What consequences is this new round in the arms race fraught with? New Times has asked Soviet and foreign experts to give thought to these questions.

Historical Background

Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 8, Feb 85 pp 18-20

[Article by historian Grigory Khozin: "Via the Stars to the Abyss"]

[Text]

A great American scientist was once asked what his invention held out for people. He replied: "What can one expect of an infant?" If we look back at the beginnings and the early years of American astronautics it must be admitted that in relation to this "infant" the Pentagon has played several roles at once—those of midwife, mentor and arbiter of its future.

The first ever liquid-fuel rocket went

up on March 16, 1926. This happened at a farm in Auburn, Massachusetts, belonging to Robert Goddard's Aunt Effie who had allowed her nephew to build a pyramid-like structure in the backyard. The structure was a simple launching pad. The rocket rose to a height of 13 metres, levelled off and flew horizontally 59 metres to come down in a neighbours' cabbage patch. Goddard went on experimenting, this

time at an artillery range at Camp Devens.

The next developments with a direct bearing on the laying of the foundations for the U.S. space programme took place in the thirties and the early forties in Germany under the auspices of the Society for Space Travel. One of its active members, Eugen Snger, a zealous proponent of the use of outer space for military purposes, corresponded with Goddard. In the early forties German experts had several military rocket projects on the stocks. After the defeat of the Nazi military machine the most talented German scientists and engineers headed by Wernher von Braun and Walter Dornberger turned up in the United States, where they applied themselves to the realization of the first U.S. space projects. (See New Times No. 49, 1984, for details about the relevant Operation Paperclip.)

A warning of the dangers with which the use of space rockets for military purposes was fraught was given as far back as 1934 by the future Soviet Chief Designer Sergei Korolyov in his book "Rocket Flight in the Stratosphere." "Needless to say," he wrote, "in the imperialist countries rockets will least of all be used for scientific and research purposes. Their main use will be military."

In March 1946 Project RAND (later RAND Corporation), a research organization created by the U.S. Air Corps, put out a voluminous study entitled "Preliminary Design of an Experimental World-Circling Spaceship." Long before the launching of the first American artificial Earth satellites, the study went on record: "The achievement of the satellite craft by the United States ... would probably produce repercussions in the world comparable to the explosion of the atomic bomb.... The nation which first makes significant achievements in space travel will be acknowledged as the world leader in both military and scientific techniques." Thus American astronautics had a military uniform prepared for it even before its birth.

From the very outset rivalry began between the services of the U.S. armed forces over who was to be in charge of military space projects. We shall not go into these squabbles in detail. But they once again demonstrate that in the late forties and mid-fifties priority in the

U.S. was invariably given to projects connected with the development of spy, military communications and meteorological satellites. Long-term research was under way with the object of ascertaining the possibilities for the creation of manned and unmanned weapon systems for deployment in outer space and for use against targets in orbit and on the earth's surface. A typical Defence Department press release of the time read: "Studies relating to a satellite programme as mentioned in 1949 are active and are proceeding at a rate commensurate with the technical state of the art. These studies are being co-ordinated within the Office of the Secretary of Defence and provide for full utilization of the combined efforts of the services."

Another essential feature of the development of U.S. astronautics is that at all stages the political and military leaders were morbidly sensitive to the Soviet Union's space achievements. The U.S. propaganda machine kept up a cry about the "aggressive orientation" of our space programme, ascribing to the Soviet Union intentions which it never entertained. Here is a statement made by Lyndon Johnson, then Senate majority leader and later President of the United States: "The Roman Empire controlled the world because it could build roads. Later—when it moved to sea—the British Empire was dominant because it had ships. In the air age we were powerful because we had airplanes. Now the Communists have established a foothold in outer space."

There have been three periods in the history of the U.S. space programme when the Administration has placed particular emphasis on the militarization of outer space.

The first was in the late fifties. The launching of the Soviet artificial earth satellite cast doubts in the eyes of the whole world on the contention that the United States was the leader in scientific and technological progress. At that time there was much talk about the military threat presented by satellites. Three working groups studied the reasons for the lag of the U.S. in space research and submitted to the administration proposals for overcoming the lag. They recommended more rapid dispersal of the Strategic Air Force bases, early development of anti-missile defences, stepped-up measures for civil defence, greater emphasis on basic and applied research in the sciences, and strengthening of conventional for-

ces for "limited" wars. There was a veritable spate of projects for satellites, manned space vehicles of military significance, and space-based weapons. Diverse variants of military orbital stations, missile bases on the moon, even a scheme for "capturing" an asteroid and installing engines on it to divert it from its trajectory at the territory of the adversary were discussed. But none of them were realized. There were not enough funds and the level of technology and science was not yet high enough.

Nevertheless in October 1959 the U.S. tested a weapon system which can be called the prototype of the ASAT anti-satellite system. And in the sixties two anti-satellite systems based on the Nike-Zeus and Thor missiles were deployed.

The main projects on which the Pentagon began working at the time were the spy satellites SAMOS (optical surveillance) and MIDAS (observation in the infra-red range), and also the Discoverer project. The latter involved a search for the technical solutions needed for the development of satellite systems for the guidance of combat operations of the armed forces in peacetime and in local conflicts, as well as of components of future space weapons.

In the sixties the Defence Department made several unsuccessful attempts to develop purely military manned space vehicles. The Blue Gemini project, the military variant of the two-man Gemini capsule, did not even enter the realization stage. And the MOL military orbital laboratory scheme was dropped in 1968 after some \$1.5 billion had been spent on it.

The second militarist upswing in U.S.

space programmes reached its peak in the late sixties when heated debates began on a large-scale ABM system. The virtues of the so-called "thin" and "thick" ABM systems over U.S. territory were praised to the skies. These were to find their logical continuation in a shipboard, airborne and spaceborne ABM system for intercepting missiles in flight. Even the cost of these plans was calculated; it ran into hundreds of billions of dollars.

Common sense, however, prevailed at the time. Bilateral talks resulted in some limitations being placed on offensive weapon systems and the Soviet-American treaty on the limitation of ABM systems signed in 1972 and the protocol appended to it limited the number of areas with ABM installations to one each.

Now we are in the midst of the third space wave. It began with the entry into the White House of Ronald Reagan in 1980. Incidentally, the arguments now advanced in favour of a large-scale ABM system with elements of basing in outer space are very much like the so-called Panama Hypothesis of the early sixties. It was set forth in a book published in the U.S. under the title "Conflict in Space. A Pattern of War in a New Dimension," which maintained that there were strategic areas of military, commercial and scientific significance in outer space which the U.S. had to occupy. "Even under a condition of general world disarmament ... competition would continue... between communist countries and the Free World," was the argument. "Russia might claim lunar Panamas, if in a position to do so, and thus acquire significant advantage...."

Origins of SDI

Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 8, Feb 85 pp 20-21

[Article by journalist Vladimir Kazakov: "The Third Wave"]

[Text]

Shortly before Ronald Reagan entered the White House, a group of scientists, politicians and industrialists headed by Senator Malcolm Wallop, the physicist Edward Teller and General Daniel Graham (retired) made a statement supporting the deployment of weapons in outer

space. Reagan's military adviser in the election campaign, General Graham helped produce the "High Frontier," a research document demanding, in no uncertain terms, an "absolutely reliable" anti-missile defence system—a kind of Maginot Line in space.

The ideas raised in the book caught the President's fancy, and in March 1983—two years after taking office—he made a speech setting out a programme for "star wars," and urging the intensive development of weapons intended to destroy targets in and from space. This, then, marked the start of the third wave.

The idea of building a "space shield" led to a change from the strategic concept of "mutual assured destruction" to that of "assured U.S. survival." The Reagan Administration became the first government ever openly to identify its foreign policy with the spread of the arms race to outer space.

Allocations to the civil programmes of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) were slashed right away for the benefit of military programmes. In 1983, for instance, NASA got \$6.4 billion as against the \$8.5 billion allocated to the Pentagon's space projects (the latter figure soared to over \$14 billion last year). NASA's research programme has virtually been nullified also by the establishment of U.S. Air Force secret flight control points at the Florida and Texas space centres.

In fact, the U.S. Administration had taken major steps towards the militarization of space even before the President made his "star wars" speech. On July 4, 1982, the President signed a directive on setting up an interdepartmental co-ordination group—a new space programme control body. The group was to be responsible for the development of "space" doctrines and new technology utilization concepts.

Two months later, on September 1, Air Force Space Command was established. In May 1983, a start was made on the Joint Space Operations Centre nine miles away from Colorado Springs. The Centre is to look after satellite control and the military aspect of the Space Shuttle programme. Next, there emerged a similar Space Command of the Navy, and in 1984, a Joint Space Command of the U.S. Armed Forces.

According to Jane's Spaceflight Annual, an authoritative reference publication, a group of 50 astronauts is undergoing secret training in the U.S. to carry out military missions. Plans are afoot to form a separate division, with one of its main func-

tions being to test laser-tracking instruments and devices as part of the "star wars" programme.

A programme to develop nuclear power plants for space vehicles was launched on February 11, 1983. Research and development work in this field was virtually frozen in 1973 because it was of no practical use then. Henry Slone of the Lewis Space Flight Centre told the U.S. House of Representatives that by the mid-nineties it would be possible to put such nuclear power plants to military uses.

Following Reagan's speech, the National Security Council issued Directive 6-83, which sanctioned a programme of research into an anti-missile defence system partially based in outer space. Up to \$27 billion are to be allocated to this research programme in 1985-89. The total cost of building such an anti-missile defence system is estimated at \$500 billion.

On January 25, 1984, President Reagan announced a plan to build an \$8 billion (preliminary estimate) permanent orbital station—Columbus. Its first components are to be assembled in space by 1992. Observers are of the opinion that the station will be used as a platform for optimizing space weapon components and assemblies, and as a military intelligence, communications and command base. This project is directly linked to the plans for creating a space industry, expected to profit Californian corporations above all. Experts say its products will be too expensive at first for any buyer but the Pentagon.

A little earlier, on January 6, President Reagan signed Directive No. 119, which provides for the allocation of almost \$2 billion in 1985 for the development of laser, beam and kinetic weapons. Back in 1980, the U.S. Navy destroyed a flying helicopter by means of a gas-dynamic laser under the Sea Light programme. In the autumn of 1982 a secret experiment was carried out to demonstrate the value of lasers as anti-ICBM weapons. In 1983, a Sidewinder supersonic missile and a controlled target were put out of action by means of a 400-kw laser installed on board a special plane. That same year, it was decided to build a laser weapon testing range at

the White Sands missile base, New Mexico, and to allocate an additional \$7 million to the development of beam weapons.

Three types of space-based laser weapons are now being developed—two of them (Talon Gold and Lode) by the Lockheed Corporation, and one (Alfa) by the TRW corporation. A rapid-fire electromagnetic gun is on the drawing boards. Work is in progress on the Chair Heritage and White Horse beam weapons intended for the U.S. Navy and Air Force. At the same time, plans are afoot for the deployment of modern anti-missile systems.

On June 10, 1984, an ICBM warhead was, for the first time, missile-intercepted over the Pacific, at an altitude of 160 km, as part of the programme to set up a new anti-missile defence system.

On January 21 and November 13, 1984, the miniature homing vehicle (MHV) anti-satellite system was tested for the first time. Such systems are due to be deployed in 1987.

This system marks the advent of a new generation of space weapons. In March, the President is to give the U.S. Air Force the go-ahead to test the MHV system on targets in space. Such test plans, which go far beyond the bounds of "research," are especially alarming. Even after the recent Gromyko-Shultz meeting in Geneva, President Reagan has said that all the so-called "space weapon research projects" would continue.

All this goes to show that for Washington space is an arena of confrontation. The first strictly military mission of the Discovery space shuttle, performed last month, is fresh evidence of this.

West European Attitudes

Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 8, Feb 85 pp 21-23

[Article by journalist Boris Slavin: "By Hook or by Crook"]

[Text]

Most people in Western Europe agree that space "superweapons" destabilize the world situation. The side that possesses no "strategic defence system" will naturally be concerned lest the other side, which has such a defence system, is preparing to strike first. This will aggravate East-West confrontation, spur on the arms race, cancel out many of the peace agreements now in force (the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems above all), soak up colossal sums of money and, as a result, undermine world security. The British Guardian writes that the "star wars" programme will add an enormous and costly new dimension to the nuclear arms race, with the result that international security will depend, to an ever greater extent,

on the stability of computerized weapon systems—so sophisticated that they can be put to the test only in a war.

The public is not taken in by Washington's argument that a space-based anti-ballistic missile system will spare the world a nuclear war. Experts at the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London say that such a "shield" will be useless against cruise missiles or other weapon systems operating within the earth's atmosphere. All it can bring, therefore, is a re-orientation of the nuclear arms race, not an end to it.

Of course, opinions in Western Europe differ.

Speaking in Rennes earlier this month, President Mitterrand of France called for the development by the West

European countries of a manned military orbital station, the French paper *L'Humanité* reports. Furthermore, the President said that even if the other West European capitals declined to take part in this project, Paris would go ahead with it.

At about the same time the French Defence Minister Charles Hernu, speaking in Munich at the annual international conference of the West German military research society *Wehrkunde*, deprecated the U.S. "star wars" plans.

The West German government backs the American plans for the militarization of outer space. That is the conclusion drawn by French television from a statement made in the last few days by Chancellor Helmut Kohl.

Prime Minister Wilfried Martens of Belgium recently spoke in support of the U.S. Administration's plans to build up a space-based anti-missile system.

Ex-general Robert Close, now a Belgian senator, once gained notoriety through his persistent attempts to foment a "Soviet tank blitz" scare in Western Europe. Today he is calling on West Europeans to consider joining the American "strategic defence initiative." This, he claims, would make it possible to replace the "assured mutual destruction" doctrine by the "assured mutual survival," and dismissing such a prospect would, he says, be an "unpardonable error."

Some people are demanding that Western Europe should set about developing a space weapon system of its own. "As for high technology—lasers in particular—France and Europe are not too badly off," the French *L'Express* wrote. "Politically, the Federal Republic of Germany could take part in this development effort without changing its status as a non-nuclear power."

An overwhelming majority of West Europeans reject the "star wars" programme, however. The Americans regard this as a case of temporary misunderstanding, and the U.S. President has reacted to the criticisms of his "star wars" plans as follows: "Well, I'll get them to understand what it is."

Having consented to discuss the space problem at the negotiating table, the United States has tried hard to convince its partners that its programmes amount merely to harmless research, and that there is no telling what will come of it. Speaking in London, Robert McFarlane, Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, said that whether a working anti-ballistic missile system was a realistic proposition could be judged only in five to ten years from now, and that therefore today's anxieties were premature and unfounded.

Finally, Washington alleges that it is looking after not just its own interests, but those of its ungrateful allies as well. "To mollify European concern about the [American] research programme," the *London Times* writes, "Mr Weinberger repeatedly emphasized that the SDI was intended to protect both Western Europe and the United States. 'The security of the United States is inseparable from the security of Western Europe,' he said."

The U.S.A.'s campaign to "condition" its allies is aimed not only at achieving political unity. There are also plans to involve Western Europe in the American "star wars" schemes. One such scheme, drawn up by Professor Fred Hoffman's commission at the end of 1983, has been made public. It boils down to the following: the U.S.A. is to develop a wide-scale anti-ballistic missile system with some of its elements based in space; Western Europe is to take part in setting up a ground-based anti-missile belt to be deployed on its territory; the belt is to include about a thousand U.S.-made Patriot missiles as its basic components.

West Germany and the Netherlands have already signed contracts to purchase the Patriot missile system. Now Washington is trying hard to talk Belgium and some of its other allies into following suit. The Patriots are now sold as air defence complexes, but it makes no difference in what clothing the American wolf is let into the West

European fold. The chief thing now is to push these weapons in. Their modernization will then be only a question of time. "After two decades of development intended to make it the U.S. army's front-line anti-aircraft weapon, the Patriot missile system is being transformed to be able to shoot down Soviet missiles, according to Defence Department officials," the New York

Times wrote. U.S. Brigadier-General James Cerce has confirmed that the Patriot system is a multi-purpose weapon which can be used for missile interception. The first American battalions armed with the new weapons have already arrived in West Germany.

In short, the plan to draw the West Europeans into the "space" arms race is being carried out, whether by hook or by crook.

Technical, Strategic Prospects

Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 8, Feb 85 pp 25-27

[Interview by NEW TIMES observer Dmitriy Pogorzhe'skiy with "expert" Aleksey Karenin]

[Text] **Question.** By commencing its plans to militarize outer space, the United States is striving for military superiority at the expense of other countries' security. Is this aim attainable?

Answer. As far as we know, the tendency towards militarizing outer space has manifested itself in the United States from the very beginning of the space age. The United States objected to Soviet proposals made at the United Nations in the second half of the 1950s and designed to prevent the arms race from spreading to outer space. These proposals were not realized precisely because of the negative stand taken by the West.

This striving to exploit scientific and technological progress for militarist purposes is very typical of American policy. It is enough to recall the history of the harnessing of nuclear energy. First the atomic bomb was made and only then were atomic power plants started. As soon as it got hold of the terrible atomic weapon, Washington set about whipping up international tension and pursuing power politics.

These are all signs of an old syndrome—the yearning for military superiority. Now that rough military-strategic parity exists between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A., the Warsaw Treaty and the NATO countries, certain circles in the United States are pinning their hopes of upsetting this balance on outer space in particular. They are banking on the scientific and technological potential

of the United States, on its economic capabilities.

But whoever harbours such plans would do well to remember that all this is a repeat of history. There were plans to prevent the Soviet Union recovering from the Nazi aggression, to achieve decisive superiority over it on the basis of Washington's temporary atomic monopoly. By their heroic work the Soviet people foiled these plans. Then there were plans to achieve superiority by deploying bombers on a mass scale, and when the missile era set in, hopes were pinned on land- and sea-based intercontinental ballistic missiles. But Washington did not achieve what it wanted. So the next move was to fit missiles with MIRV warheads (multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicles) in the 1960s, and after that there began the deployment of a new lethal strategic offensive weapon—the long-range cruise missile (1970s). The U.S.S.R. has taken measures to counter the increased threat to its security.

Now Washington is turning its eyes to outer space in the hope that the road to superiority lies there. But history offers convincing evidence of the unattainability of such hopes. The very idea of superiority is unfeasible and essentially untenable. On the other hand, the balance of forces is a reliable guarantee of peace in present-day conditions. And the U.S.S.R. will not allow anyone to upset this balance. The necessary weapons will be developed to

counter the American space strike weapons.

But the U.S.S.R. is totally against any continuation of the arms race. All its proposals are directed at putting an end to military rivalry and preventing the militarization of outer space. That such a danger exists is evidenced by the American plans for creating a large-scale ABM system.

Question: How do the American strategists visualize this system in practice?

Answer: The "theory" is presented in the U.S. as follows. Several ABM layers are created, and each hits a certain percentage of the ballistic missiles trying to reach targets, thereby eliminating or almost eliminating the hypothetical enemy's nuclear potential.

Basically, there can be three main ABM layers: the first deals with missiles as they are launched; the second while they are in mid-flight; and the third when they reach the final stage of their trajectory.

Research and practical work to develop new technology for use in a large-scale ABM system are in full swing in the United States. Special hopes are pinned on the so-called directed energy weapons. These can be termed beam weapons because they hit targets with a laser beam, or a stream of high energy particles of atomic hydrogen, deuterium or tritium, or a microwave beam. The ABM beam systems are to be used in outer space where they are particularly effective.

As we can see, this is an exceptionally sophisticated and costly system.

Question: What is the military-political purpose of the project?

Answer: U.S. propaganda is trying hard to prove the "peaceful" nature of the programme. It is said that a space-based ABM system will strengthen "deterrence," that is, defence. In reality, the large-scale ABM system is conceived as a supplement to offensive strategic arms, as a means of ensuring that the first nuclear strike is delivered with impunity. Under cover of a space-based ABM system it is intended to

deprive the other side of the possibility to retaliate.

Hence the huge destabilizing potential of the American "strategic defence initiative." By placing a large-scale ABM system in outer space, Washington hopes to get an instrument of blackmail against other nations. That is why, as it develops its ABM programme in a hurry, Washington continues to deploy new MX intercontinental ballistic missiles and long-range cruise missiles of all types of basing, to build new strategic bombers and to rearm its fleet of missile-carrying submarines.

Question: Will the creation of the above-mentioned system be a violation of the 1972 Soviet-American treaty on the limitation of ABM systems?

Answer: Yes, it will. U.S. Secretary of Defence Caspar Weinberger has publicly declared that in order to implement its programme the United States is prepared to revise or even renounce the ABM treaty. Similar statements have also come from the well-known exponent of the "strategic defence initiative" in the United States, Colin Gray, an adviser at the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

However, even the statement of the intention to establish a large-scale ABM system with some of its elements based in space—and such a statement has been made by President Reagan—directly contradicts the letter and spirit of the treaty itself and the provisions of Article 1, under which each party undertakes not to deploy ABM systems for defence of the territory of its country and not to provide a base for such a defence. There would be a flagrant violation of another important limitation contained in the treaty's Article 5—not to develop, test or deploy space-based ABM systems or components.

So a large-scale ABM system with elements of space basing can be deployed only at the price of renouncing the 1972 treaty. This is added evidence of Washington's flippant attitude towards the commitments it assumes

under international agreements.

Question: Is it possible to stop this process, to prevent the arms race from spreading to outer space?

Answer: This can be done and it must be done. That is how the Soviet side views the issue.

A practical possibility of adopting effective measures to prevent an arms race in outer space and stop it on earth is afforded by the Soviet-American talks due to open in Geneva on March 12. In the present circumstances these talks offer the only possible hope of solving the problem of nuclear and space arms. Today it is impossible to limit, and still less to reduce, nuclear arms without taking effective measures to prevent the militarization of space. This interconnection is clearly recorded in the joint Soviet-American statement on the results of the Gromyko-Shultz meeting in Geneva.

What is needed now is honest adherence to this agreement, adherence in practice to all its components. And, of course, any steps obstructing constructive talks are impermissible.

As for the Soviet Union, it is entirely in favour of this. "A positive outcome of the new Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms," President Chernenko stressed, "would favourably influence the world situation, would greatly contribute to solving the cardinal problems of today.

"The Soviet Union will work in this direction, will seek meaningful and definite results in Geneva."

The Soviet side expects the United States to take the same stand.

Soviet Proposals Listed

Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 8, Feb 85 p 26

[Unattributed item]

[Text]

The Soviet Union has initiated and participated in all the existing international agreements directed at the use of outer space for peaceful purposes, for the good of mankind. It has repeatedly come up with proposals designed to keep weapons out of space. Let us recall the most important of them.

October 4, 1957

The earth's first artificial satellite is launched. Soviet people regard the outstanding new successes of Soviet science as a guarantee of the further creative work of Soviet scientists and specialists in the interests of peace and progress, writes the newspaper Pravda.

March 1958

The Soviet government proposes a ban on the military use of outer space, and the commencement of international co-operation in space exploration. The West responds negatively.

1962-64

The U.S.S.R. makes a number of proposals directed at disarmament, such as introducing international control over the launching of missiles for peaceful purposes, banning the orbiting and emplacement in space of delivery vehicles of weapons of mass destruction.

January 1967

A treaty on principles governing the activities of states in the exploration and use of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies is signed by the U.S.S.R., the U.S.A. and Britain on Moscow's initiative.

May 1972

Moscow and Washington conclude a treaty on the limitation of anti-ballistic missile systems. The two sides undertake not to create sea-air-, space- or mobile ground-based ABM systems and not to deploy ABM systems limited by the treaty outside their national territories.

July 1974

A protocol to the 1972 Soviet-American ABM treaty is signed.

Under this protocol the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. agree to have only one area each for the deployment of ABM systems.

May 1977

The U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. sign an agreement concerning co-operation in the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes.

September 1981

The Soviet Union submits to the 36th U.N. General Assembly a proposal to conclude an international treaty prohibiting the stationing of weapons of any type in outer space.

August 1983

The U.S.S.R. pledges not to be the first to put into outer space any types of anti-satellite weapons whatsoever so long as other countries, including the United States, also refrain from launching anti-satellite weapons of any type.

September 1983

The Soviet Union puts before the 38th U.N. General Assembly a draft treaty on the prohibition of the use of force in outer space and from outer space with regard to earth. It provides for the liquidation of already existing anti-satellite systems, for banning the development of new types of anti-satellite weapons and also the testing and use for military purposes, including against satellites, of any manned spaceships.

December 1984

On the U.S.S.R.'s initiative, the 39th U.N. General Assembly studies the question of the use of outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes, for the benefit of mankind, and adopts a resolution on preventing an arms race in outer space.

SPACE ARMS

WEST EUROPEAN OFFICIALS' CRITIQUES OF SDI CITED

British Foreign Secretary

LD161817 Moscow TASS in English 1754 GMT 16 Mar 85

[Text] London March 16 TASS -- British Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary Geoffrey Howe criticized the political and military aspects of President Reagan's "strategic defence initiative." Speaking at the Royal United Services Institute for Defence Studies, Geoffrey Howe described the "strategic defence initiative" as the "Maignot Line of the 21st century." The creation of such a defence, he stressed, will ensure no advantages, as it can be overcome by means of comparatively simple counter-measures.

Commenting on the statement by Geoffrey Howe, the newspaper DAILY EXPRESS points out that it has been the sharpest criticism ever of President Reagan's plans by a British Cabinet member. The FINANCIAL TIMES stresses that the statement by the British foreign secretary mirrors the growing apprehensions of the British Government circles over the frenzy with which the head of the U.S. Administration is pushing through his "strategic defence initiative." The DAILY TELEGRAPH writes that such actions by the United States President may be detrimental to, and even foil the possibility of reaching agreement at the Soviet-American Geneva talks.

French Prime Minister

LD180530 Moscow TASS in English 0519 GMT 18 Mar 85

[Text] New York March 18 TASS -- Prime Minister Laurent Fabius of France has criticized the Reagan administration's plans aimed at militarizing outer space within the framework of the "Star Wars" programme. In an interview with TIME magazine, he has pointed out that the realization of the so-called Strategic Defence initiative of the White House will lead to a new round of the arms race, as a result of which the rough balance of forces that has been established in the world may be upset. The prime minister pointed out that France is for the military balance, on which peace on earth depends, to be stable. He also said that it is essential constantly to make efforts with a view to lowering the ceilings of armaments.

French Foreign Minister

Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW in English 28 Mar 85 pp 1-2

[TASS item: "French External Relations Minister on U.S. Plans To Militarize Space"]

[Text] Helsinki, March 27 (TASS)-- The official transcripts of a press conference given by French External Relations Minister Roland Dumas in Helsinki have been released here. The minister was asked, in particular, about Reagan's "star wars" program. Answering this question, Roland Dumas said: France believes that the balance of offensive forces in the world guarantees security. This has been a rule for a very long time. The American initiative, known as the "strategic defence initiative," aims at revising this doctrine. We have stated that the use of space according to the American plan actually means superarmament. The French doctrine, based on the balance of offensive forces, also presupposes that it is necessary to reduce to the lowest possible level these offensive forces, especially nuclear forces.

As for the American plan, it leads to superarmament, which would be achieved through the militarisation of space, and hence to the escalation of risks and dangers. It does not mean the striving to ensure security.

We state, anyhow, that the Americans themselves, initiating their research program, on which they will have to spend, according to their own estimates, 25 billion dollars, are simultaneously setting aside in their budget considerable funds on the modernisation of their nuclear forces. This is the best proof that the American initiative will not necessarily lead to the abolition of the nuclear forces. Anyway, it will by no means lead to this goal within the next 15-20 years. That is why, faced with such a risk of superarmament and hence the danger, in the face of doubts about the success of this plan, we turn back to the classical doctrine, which says that it is better to preserve the balance of forces while reducing them to the lowest possible level.

We state that, after a moment of hesitation, such a country as Britain, the situation of which is similar to that of France, and such a country as West Germany, which is in a very different situation because it does not have nuclear weapons, accepted the same reasoning, which prompts us the following conclusion: it is necessary to seek by all means a stop to that superarmament while there is still time. It is so far the phase of research but we do not any illusions. Doesn't common sense tell us that progress cannot be blocked? Anyway, it is necessary to seek to achieve this by all means at the point of transition from research to deployment. Hence the importance of the Geneva talks and the interest evoked by them in everyone. (PRAVDA, March 28, in full.)

Swedish Prime Minister

LD160025 Moscow TASS in English 2324 GMT 15 Mar 85

[Text] Stockholm March 16 TASS -- Prime Minister Olof Palme of Sweden has voiced criticism of the U.S. Administration's "star wars" preparation plans.

The Swedish Telegraph Bureau reports that he addressed constituents in a Stockholm suburb within the framework of the election campaign which is being conducted in the country on the eve of the forthcoming regular elections to the Riksdag (parliament) in Sweden in September this year.

The head of the Swedish Government described as illusory the hopes for ensuring U.S. security through militarization of outer space. There is every indication that this is impossible, he pointed out.

CSO: 1812/201

SPACE ARMS

THATCHER, GORBACHEV DISCUSS U.S.' SDI RESEARCH

LD132104 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 2020 GMT 13 Mar 85

[By David Healy, PA political staff]

[Text] Mrs Thatcher said tonight she had almost an hour of "very good and useful" talks in the Kremlin with the new Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev. The two leaders discussed America's star wars research and disarmament when they met after the state funeral of President Chernenko. Later, at a press conference, the prime minister said she looked forward to building "a good and frank relationship with Mr Gorbachev, with the aim of achieving a safer and more secure world."

Mrs Thatcher said that after comparing the speeches of the new Soviet leader and President Reagan, it was clear that the two men had the same objectives -- the elimination of nuclear weapons, no wish for superiority, and mutual respect. She said she told Mr Gorbachev about the West's deep and genuine desire to achieve security at a much lower level of weaponry.

She told him that President Reagan did not see research on star wars as a way of achieving advantage over the Soviet Union. Research was permitted under the 1972 treaty between the U.S. and Russian, but any deployment of the new weaponry would have to be negotiated.

"I told Mr Gorbachev that point was explicitly confirmed by President Reagan when I saw him in February," Mrs Thatcher said. Turning to the arms control talks which opened in Geneva this week, the prime minister said she had expressed the hope that these would be successful.

She believed Mr Gorbachev was also anxious that the talks should succeed. "I believe the whole world would dearly love to see security maintained at a lower level of armaments based on mutual respect and security," Mrs Thatcher said.

"It will be part of the wish of the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union to keep in touch and have a dialogue which we believe is essential to creating trust and confidence which in turn is vital to reaching arms agreement. A great deal has happened, much of it tragic, in the 12 months or so since I was in Moscow but I now look forward to building on the basis of a good, and frank relationship with Mr Gorbachev, with the aim of achieving a safer and more secure world."

Asked whether after today's talks she stood by her previous opinion that Gorbachev was a man she liked and could do business with, the prime minister replied simply

"yes." "We briefly touched on relations between our two countries and our wish to do more business with the Soviet Union," Mrs Thatcher said.

She hoped to see more cultural and scientific contacts as well as trading links "so our two nations can achieve a better understanding. In this context we look forward to Mr Gromyko's visit to Britain this summer."

The prime minister's meeting with the new Soviet leader began some 40 minutes behind schedule and British officials said Mr Gorbachev was talking much longer with visiting leaders than originally planned. Mrs Thatcher, who had earlier met U.S. Vice President George Bush, said she did not raise the possibility of a superpower summit with either man. Mr Bush had arrived in Moscow reportedly carrying an invitation from President Reagan to a summit.

The prime minister, who is flying back home later tonight, also had talks today with President Zia of Pakistan, President Machel of Mozambique, Canadian Prime Minister Brian Mulroney, Spanish Premier Felipe Gonzalez and Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi.

CSO: 5200/2554

SPACE ARMS

THATCHER DISCUSSES SDI, MX PRODUCTION

BK021341 Singapore THE SUNDAY TIMES in English 31 Mar 85 p 19

["Exclusive interview" with Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher by John Drysdale, correspondent, in London on Thatcher's upcoming Southeast Asian Tour; date not specified]

[Excerpts]

Q: Given that the U.S. Strategic Defence Initiative is a response to Soviet SDI research, does the U.S. Government fully accept the British Government's view that the deployment of space weapons is juridically a matter for negotiation?

A: The president said so within Camp David in the four points to which he agreed, and when I was there in a press conference at the end of our talks he said so again. The anti-ballistic treaty, as you know, was signed by both the United States and the Soviet Union in 1972. Research is not contrary to that treaty in any way -- totally permitted by it -- for very obvious reasons: There is no way of verifying how much research is going on on the other side.

There are certain weapons that can be developed under that treaty but they are fairly restrictive; certain radar developments that can take place, but again they are specified by the treaty. Once you get beyond that into deployment, and in some cases into deployment, and in some cases into testing, it is a matter for negotiation. The United States is a signatory to that treaty. Obviously she will honour it.

Q: Are you happy about the decision in the United States about the production of 21 MX missiles? Do you think this might have an adverse effect on the Geneva talks?

A: No, I do not. You might say the same about cruise missiles here.

But, you know the firmness of Western countries in deploying cruise missiles and the lesson to the Soviet Union that they could not use propaganda in a free society to cloud people's view of the nature of the Soviet system, must be a lesson which perhaps surprised them -- the lesson was they could not influence Western public opinion, and the lesson was that we were firm.

We did what we said we would do. That, added to the fact that they obviously -- by Mr Gromyko's visit to the United States -- took the view that the President was going to be there for another term: I think that brought them back to the negotiating table.

SPACE ARMS

UK'S FOREIGN OFFICE DOWNPLAYS HOWE-PERLE SDI EXCHANGE

LD201808 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1530 GMT 20 Mar 85

[By Tom McMullan, PA political staff]

[Excerpt] The Foreign Office today sought to play down speculation that Britain and the United States are close to an open quarrel over American plans for the strategic defence initiative--the so-called star wars technology. This follows American reaction to a speech in London last Friday by Sir Geoffrey Howe. The foreign secretary's analysis--the first in public by a senior British minister--was seen as expressing scepticism about the U.S. plans.

U.S. Ambassador Mr Charles Price called on Sir Geoffrey at the Foreign Office today. The ambassador's call followed what was seen as a rebuke to Sir Geoffrey in a speech in London last night by Mr Richard Perle, U.S. assistant secretary of defence. In what some observers saw as the strongest public attack in recent years by one ally to another, Mr Perle described the foreign secretary's speech as "tendentious."

The Foreign Office spokesman said the ambassador's visit lasted 25 minutes and was part of a regular series of exchanges on a wide range of subjects, including East-West relations and arms control. Sir Geoffrey's speech on the strategic implications of the star wars technology was among the subjects discussed, he added. However, the spokesman would not comment on suggestions that the ambassador was objecting to the tone of the speech.

CSO: 5200/2554

7 May 85

SPACE ARMS

THATCHER BACKS 'STAR WARS' RESEARCH IN COMMONS

LD121742 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1627 GMT 12 Mar 85

[By PA parliamentary staff]

[Text] The prime minister--facing MPs before flying to the Moscow funeral of President Chernenko--backed America's 'Star Wars' weapons research despite criticism from her Tory predecessor Edward Heath, which was quickly exploited by the opposition leader. "I shall say that the United States is right to do the research," she declared in the Commons. Mrs Thatcher did not directly refer to Mr Heath's attack. She told MPs: "It would be difficult to get an agreement on research. There is no way of verifying what research is going on. I shall point out that when it comes to deployment and testing, that is already covered by the antiballistic agreement, that is why I would expect it to be dealt with in that way."

Labour leader Neil Kinnock seized at Commons question time, the outspoken criticism of the star wars programme earlier today by Mr Heath who sat listening to the exchanges. Mr Kinnock taunted Mrs Thatcher with the former premier's claim that the project would be "decoupling, destabilising and a diversion of resources." He demanded: "Since that is so obviously true why trail on, toadying behind the Americans? Why not do what a real friend would do and tell them they are wrong?"

Mrs Thatcher also dismissed a renewed call from Liberal leader David Steel to include Britain's Polaris missile force in arms negotiations. "I do not believe either our own nuclear deterrent or France's nuclear deterrent should be counted in," she said. It amounted to 3 percent of the Soviet equivalent, and the stance could only be reconsidered when the Russians reduced their own missile strength "very substantially indeed." She hoped that the Geneva arms talks would "end in a successful agreement."

The prime minister also voiced hopes of an improvement in human rights in the Soviet Union, to support from MPs on both sides of the Commons. Mrs Thatcher said a new Russian approach to human rights would mark the 10th anniversary of the signing of the Helsinki Accord. "I hope the Helsinki Final Act will one day be implemented fully," she said. "The 10th year since they were signed is as good a time as any to begin."

Tory Sir Anthony Grant (Cambridgeshire South West) said the most welcome sign of a change in Soviet attitude would be "a halt to the genocide still going on in Afghanistan." "That would be very welcome indeed," Mrs Thatcher agreed.

CSO: 5200/2554

SPACE ARMS

FRG HOLDS TALKS WITH UK ON STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE

LD211747 Hamburg DPA in German 1636 GMT 21 Mar 85

[Text] Koenigswinter, 21 Mar (DPA)---The need for closer German-British cooperation because of the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative determined the subject of the 35th German-British talks today in Koenigswinter, near Bonn. This first postwar political series of talks to which the Federal Republic was invited by one of the victorious powers also involved Federal President Richard von Weizsaecker, who stressed the problem of joint security in the Atlantic alliance. This problem must not be discussed solely from the point of view of the connection to the latest technology. Anyone who believes that deterrence is needed as a defense strategy must say this clearly even with the development of new technologies, Von Weizsaecker noted, and also stressed that his duty toward political restraint forbade him from more detailed remarks.

FDP Deputy Hildegard Hamm-Bruecher saw in the Koenigswinter talks the chance "to cultivate" German-British relations "just as carefully" as German-French relations. She referred to "certain uncomfortable persistent questions" about whether Bonn is striving for two levels, not only in the EC, but also in its relations with its neighbors.

The director of the Royal Insitute of International Affairs, retired Admiral Sir James Eberle, noted: "If the price for the development of a space defense system means a return to an increased risk of conventional wars, then this price is too high." Eberle predicted changes in Atlantic relations and said that the Europeans should concentrate on coping with this. Nuclear deterrence is, in any event, a vital basis for NATO.

The minister of state at the British Foreign Office, Baroness Young, and numerous politicians and diplomats from the Federal Republic and Great Britain, including the ambassadors from the two countries, are taking part in the Koenigswinter talks, which end on Saturday.

CSO: 5200/2550

SPACE ARMS

BACKGROUND TO SCEPTICAL SDI RESPONSE IN FRG

Hamburg DIE ZEIT in German 22 Feb 85 p 1

[Commentary by Theo Sommer: "The Broad Hint with Missiles. Scepticism toward Reagan's Space Plans"]

[Text] Ronald Reagan's lobbyists are fanning out throughout the alliance and are beating the drums for the science fiction dream of a watertight defense against missiles from space--known as "SDI" in the jargon of the experts, strategic defense initiatives, "star wars" in the blunt abbreviated language of the headlines. And yet it has not been decided by a long shot in Washington what is actually desirable and feasible: an "absolutely reliable and total missile defense" (U.S. Defense Minister Weinberger), which will once and for all render Moscow's nuclear missiles "impotent and obsolete" (Reagan)--or at best a limited defense for America's own intercontinental missiles. The difference is momentous: the first course would mean a complete abandonment of that balance of terror which has preserved the peace for the past 40 years, the second would mean strengthening this balance for the immediate future.

The chancellor was not disturbed by these unclarities. He has signaled to the Americans Bonn's willingness to participate in their missile defense research. He did, to be sure, link several expectations to this willingness which can also be construed as preconditions: the strategy of flexible response should not be tampered with; there should be no zones of varying security in the alliance, no uncoupling of Europe from America: developments must be based on the cooperation of the two major powers; until such time as there are new, mutually acceptable agreements, the ABM agreement which subjected missile defense to certain limits must be enforced; keeping the alliance partners informed and consulting with them must be assured. But the chancellor's offer was shot from the hip. The inter-ministerial working group which is investigating the effect of Reagan's space plans on the Atlantic alliance in the Federal chancellery, and which is to define the Federal German interests, is not nearly finished with its deliberations.

The SDI fans also include Minister-President Lothar Spaeth of Baden-Wuerttemberg. Last week he exclaimed enthusiastically in Washington: "We concern ourselves too much with the military and security aspects and overlook the fact that concealed behind this program is a new technological generation in which we must be involved if we want to continue in our role of a

modern industrial nation." Here an idealistic obsession links up with Reagan's dream of absolute invulnerability of America--the urge to thrust forward into a new technological era via space. Here too, however, the enthusiasm is based more on emotion than on sober reflection. As yet the Americans do not even know in what direction their research should go--their Horserace studies, based on which the Pentagon then plans to formulate its invitation for bids, are not expected until next month. There are still highly divergent views in Washington as to whether and how the allies are to participate in the SDI research program. Official government involvement? Or simply the participation of individual firms in the bidding? Nor does West German industry have any sort of clear perception as yet as to how substantial the technological thrust really is that will emanate from the SDI research.

New [Armament] Race

So why the hurry? There are many grave reasons for considering the whole Star Wars plan as a fata morgana; as a dangerous aberration which will not slow down but accelerate the arms race; as a "utopian focusing point for a real-life failure"--namely, the failure to control and eventually reduce the burgeoning missile arsenals of the superpowers by political means; as one of those technological fixes so very dear to the Americans, even though experience has shown that they always create more problems than they solve. A vote against missile defense from space can at any rate be supported with serious arguments. But an assessment of the project, as well, will for the time being have to await the answers to a series of sceptical questions.

These questions are of the greatest urgency with respect to the general development of the East-West relationship.

1. If the U.S. pushes the research and development of missile defense from space and at the same time works on six new offensive systems--how should Moscow not take this as an effort by the Americans to make themselves invulnerable and at the same time strengthen their strategic offensive potential? Why should the Soviets not build up their own missile defense? Sooner or later they would catch up--and then a new race would begin to see who can be the first to outsmart the defense. And why should they not simply underrun or inundate Reagan's defense system? To do that, they could either put more intercontinental missiles--of which they currently have 1,400 with 5,000 warheads--into service, perhaps even "decoy" missiles, or, failing that, more systems against which radiation weapons or space shots have little or no effect: submarine-launched missiles, cruise missiles, "fast launch" missiles.

2. Against a global political background in which the armament race in this way receives powerful impulses, how is armament control to have a chance at all, to say nothing of disarmament? And to put it quite bluntly: what hopes can we have then of being able to reduce the Eastern medium range potential--all those SS-20 and SS-22 which are directed at Western Europe?

3. On what is the security of the Western world based during that precarious interim phase, which might last two to five decades, during which the defense

umbrellas are highly porous, but the attack inclination is finitely stronger? How can the continued reliance on the balance of nuclear horror be politically and psychologically maintained into the next century, if Ronald Reagan and his troubadors now label the whole deterrence system as "immorality"? Their intent is in this way to cut off the roots of the peace movement, yet in reality they are destroying the moral basis of the current Western security policies.

Other questions must pertain to the effects on the strategy of the NATO alliance.

1. What will be the situation when one day both sides have missile defense systems, even if they are only 80 percent effective? America and Russia would then become sacred territories--"sanctuaries," so to speak, which the adversary spares. What will then become of the strategy of flexible response, which in the final analysis is nurtured by the threat of limited nuclear attacks against the Soviet Union? Every Soviet missile defense would completely destroy its credibility, which is not overly great as it is. The prospect of waging a conventional war in Europe would increase again. Whether the governments want it or not: a psychological uncoupling of Europe from America would probably be inescapable if the vulnerability of America decreases while that of Europe increases.

Umbrella over Europe?

2. If, however--in order to avoid "zones of unequal security" in the alliance territory--we open a missile defense umbrella over Europe as well--what is it to look like? Are the radiation weapons in space suitable for this purpose? Or would a conventional variant of the Patriot missile be better, which would have to be installed in great numbers on our territory? Could such a system cope with the hundreds or thousands of simultaneously approaching intermediate range missiles, cruise missiles, and aircraft? And if so--is the Federal Government willing to force a new stationing debate on the nation and survive it?

3. Will not the FRG get into financial difficulty if enormous sums must be spent for the establishment of a missile defense umbrella, and our conventional defense potential is to be increased at the same time?

Several question marks must also be placed behind the dreams of the rapid breakthrough to the bright future of advanced technology.

1. Who is to be America's partner, the government, individual firms, or only selected scientists? Would Washington permit us to cooperate on a serious basis? How much influence on American strategy and politics would the involvement bring us?

2. What is it all to cost, and where is the money to come from? Will it be taken away from the Bundeswehr--or from what is left of the already battered research budget of the Federal Government? How much money and what time frames are we talking about anyway?

3. How can we be sure that in the cooperation being sought we will not be limited to puttering around on peripheral problems, while the Americans keep the entire high technology to themselves? That we will get new Teflon frying pans, but no new black boxes? That that we will help with the cooking but not be allowed to look into the pots; help finance, but for military security reasons have no access to the findings of interest?

One question after the other. The answers are lacking. An advisor to the chancellor says frankly: "We know too little. The Americans will have a lot to do in this respect. But they themselves are still at sea." And yet the Federal Government is signaling its willingness to participate: an abortive broad hint.

An argument often to be heard in Bonn is: "The train has long since left the station in America," and "the sooner we jump aboard, the better," But this is not necessarily so. All we need to do is think back to the MLF missile fleet--it sank before the keel was laid down; or to Carter's mad MX plan to run thousands of kilometers of missile trenches through Utah and Colorado--after years of talking about it, nothing came of it. A new cost computation, a different feasibility study, a new congress, a new president--and suddenly everything can take on a different appearance.

In this situation, a wait-and-see posture is better than being overly eager. First one will have to see things more clearly. And one thing we should all have learned in the meantime: a decision as momentous as this must be preceded by broad public debate. Entry into space cannot be staged surreptitiously.

12689

CSO: 5200/2523

SPACE ARMS

MUNICH CONFERENCE PROMPTS SPACE DEFENSE DISCUSSION

Kohl Supports U.S. Initiative

LD091037 Hamburg DPA in German 0814 GMT 9 Feb 85

[Text] Munich, 9 Feb (DPA)---According to Chancellor Helmut Kohl, an arms race in space must be prevented. Speaking to high-ranking defense politicians from numerous Western countries at the 22d military science gathering in Munich, Kohl, however, strongly supported the U.S. space program. One should "be clear about and take seriously" the philosophical and moral basis of President Reagan's "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI).

Slogans, particularly from the Eastern side, about the militarization of space and the American striving for nuclear superiority are misleading. The Federal Government will not only examine the arms control and military strategic aspects of SDI but also take into account the alliance and economic and technological elements. It is still too early to finally assess strategic missile defense in space, Kohl said.

It will be the end of this decade at the earliest before research in the United States reached the point that allowed final conclusions to be reached. The chancellor made it clear that a space defense system must take the strategic unity of the NATO alliance area fully into account. The U.S. program was strong incentive for Soviet readiness for disarmament negotiations. What is decisive is that the United States has promised to enter negotiations with the Soviet Union before a possible introduction of space systems.

The Federal Government has a vital interest in putting forth the German and European interests through close and trusting consultations, bilaterally and in the alliance framework, during the forthcoming new Geneva talks. "The mechanisms required for this exist and have proven themselves in the past," Kohl said. The chancellor expressed the view that the SDI, independent of whether or not the research work leads to its intended goal, would bring about a considerable technological impetus towards innovation in the United States. "A highly industrialized country like the Federal Republic and the other European allies must not be technologically ditched."

Around 150 politicians, diplomats, scholars, and journalists from the United States, France, Great Britain, and the Federal Republic, in addition to other

Western countries, are taking part in the 2-day military science gathering in the Bavarian capital. The defense experts, who are meeting at the Bayerischer Hof, are protected by a large contingent of riot police. French Defense Minister Charles Henru, his American counterpart, Caspar Weinberger, and West German Defense Minister Manfred Woerner are also due to speak at the event.

Kohl: Conditions for SDI Support

DW111057 Mainz ZDF Television Network in German 1800 GMT 9 Feb 85

[Report by Gustav Trampe from the "Heute" newscast]

[Excerpt] In Europe -- and this is again made plainly evident by this [international military science] meeting -- the idea of an antimissile system is viewed with more skepticism than in the United States. However, initial total rejection of U.S. plans has given way to a more reserved assessment, at least on the part of the Federal Government. There is cautious approval of the Americans continuing research under the proviso that certain conditions are met:

[Begin Kohl recording] First, the applicable strategy of flexible response must remain valid for the alliance without any changes as long as there is not a more effective alternative for achieving the goal of preventing war.

Second, the political and strategic unity of the alliance must be preserved. There must not be any zones of different security in the alliance nor any separation of European security from that of North America.

Third, even the development of strategic defense systems should be carried out on a cooperative basis, that is, on the basis of agreements between the superpowers. The objective must be to strengthen strategic stability. [end recording]

Kohl Urges Research Cooperation

LD091440 Hamburg DPA in German 1323 GMT 9 Feb 85

[Excerpts] Munich, 9 Feb (DPA) -- Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl (CDU) made an urgent appeal to the West Europeans to participate in research for a U.S. space defense system. "I strongly advise participating," he said on Saturday at the 22d international military science meeting in Munich. French Defense Minister Charles Hernu, however, made a strong stand against Washington's plans, in which he sees a danger of a new arms race. There is the fear that the stationing of defensive systems in outer space will result in a further increase in offensive arming on earth.

Kohl told the 150 or so high-level government representatives and deputies from the United States, France, Britain, the FRG and other Western countries that in the chancellor's office a working party was formed to investigate all the details of President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative. The Americans had not yet submitted an "official offer" for cooperation. It was necessary for the Europeans to gain "full access" to the Americans' findings. In the discussions a number of U.S. senators expressed the United States' wish for European participation in the space concept. Not just money but great intellectual inventiveness was needed for the future systems in outer space.

Kohl, who met with NATO Secretary General Lord Carrington and U.S. representatives, expressed his confidence that the forthcoming new negotiations in Geneva would lead to arms control.

Hernu is the first French defense minister to speak at the Munich forum. He did not regard it as certain that the balance that would result from the stationing of defense systems in space and from the reduction of aggressive weapons would in fact be stable. France continues to favor a "peaceful space," because this presupposed stability at the lowest level of armaments. There were "real risks of instability" in U.S. plans.

The race involving first-strike nuclear weapons should stop and the "gap between the potentials of the two superpowers and those of the other powers be reduced and therefore become of a different nature." France is convinced that peace continues to depend on the maintenance of a balance of deterrence, Hernu stressed.

SPD disarmament expert Egon Bahr also warned against a militarization of space. It would be more constructive for mankind to concentrate the genius of its researchers and engineers and its money on the development of a "structural defensive capability" on earth. What the United States strives for could be countered by the Soviet Union with a further increase in the offensive capability of its intercontinental missiles. Bahr spoke in support of seeking a new military strategy that would overcome deterrence. There would only be a chance of success for the Geneva talks on the basis of a "security partnership" between the Eastern and the Western systems.

Strauss, Woerner Address Meeting

LD101124 Hamburg DPA in German 1038 GMT 10 Feb 85

[Excerpts] Munich, 10 Feb (DPA)--CSU Chairman and Bavarian Minister President Franz Josef Strauss has come out in strong support of the U.S. plans for the development of a space defense. Speaking to the participants in the international military science gathering in Munich on Sunday, Strauss described the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) as an attempt to embark upon new paths towards the abolition of nuclear weapons.

Strauss criticized the constant talk of a "militarization" of space. New expressions must be found, such as "space for peace." However, Strauss made it clear that it would not be possible to do without nuclear weapons for the foreseeable future.

Federal Defense Minister Manfred Woerner drew the attention of U.S. senators and representatives of the government to the fact that the Federal Republic is undertaking great efforts for defense. He was indirectly rejecting American criticism that the Germans are doing too little for joint defense. Woerner spoke in favor of strengthening conventional defense. All modern technologies must be used for this purpose. The Federal Republic this year came close to the 3 percent increase in its defense budget called for by NATO.

SPD's Ehmke Hits U.S. Plan

LD091609 Hamburg DPA in German 1341 GMT 9 Feb 85

[Text] Bonn, 9 Feb (DPA)--Horst Ehmke, the deputy chairman of the SPD parliamentary group, has said that the space weapons envisioned by the United States promote instability. In an interview with Radio Free Berlin, Ehmke said that this instability between East and West would probably result in the Soviet Union redoubling its own defense efforts in order to stay abreast of the U.S. defense system, the radio station reported on Saturday. The arms race would therefore be stepped up. Ehmke expressed the fear that Europe would not come under the defensive shield created by space weapons. There was therefore the danger of Europe being split away from the United States.

CSO: 5200/2550

SPACE ARMS

KOHL INTERVIEWED ON U.S. RELATIONS, SDI

DW281317 Hamburg DIE ZEIT in German 1 Mar 85 pp 3-4

[Interview with Chancellor Helmut Kohl by correspondents Rolf Zundel and Christoph Bertram in Bonn; date not given]

[Excerpt] ZEIT: Mr Chancellor, how about the foreign political influence of the FRG today? Did the FRG's influence after counterarmament was over, decrease considerably in Washington and in Moscow? Your government said purposefully and for respectable reasons: We want to have relations so close with the United States that not even the suggestion of mistrust could come up. Do we thus run the risk of losing influence?

Kohl: We are one of the most important alliance partners of the United States, and that is important for our security. We are a reliable partner. We are partners, not subordinates or vassals. We have a relaxed relationship that is almost free of tensions. If we are of a different opinion as, for example, in connection with the 3 percent NATO defense increase, we maintain our position also against U.S. demands. So there is no question of our influence decreasing in Washington.

There can also be no talk about our influence with the Soviet Union having decreased. Naturally, the Soviet Union with its old "carrot and stick" method wanted to influence our deployment decision. However, it corresponds to the Soviet tradition and Soviet practice to respect a steadfast government more than one that is moved by every wind.

ZEIT: In your Munich speech you did not reject the controversial strategic defense initiative (SDI) of the Americans, and you even recommended German research cooperation. Didn't you thus create the impression of approval?

Kohl: I was the first European to comment on that plan. In the meantime, Margaret Thatcher and Italian Prime Minister Craxi have made similar statements. It is a fact that:

1. Up to now the Americans have not invited European participation in the SDI program.
2. In Munich I named the conditions for our participation. I pointed out for good reason that next to security-policy viewpoints, the economic and technological advantages have not been sufficiently stressed in the European discussion.

ZEIT: Is all of this at all desirable for us?

Kohl: It would be even less desirable to be excluded from such scientifically and technologically significant projects. However, European participation is for me feasible only in connection with full access to the economic advantages. A U.S. offer to help finance the project without participating in its yield, is unacceptable for me.

CSO: 5200/2550

SPACE ARMS

FRG'S SPD REITERATES DEMAND FOR SPACE ARMS MORATORIUM

LD121341 Hamburg DPA in German 1036 GMT 12 Mar 85

[Text] Bonn, 12 Mar (DPA)--The SPD has affirmed its demand to instigate at the start of the disarmament negotiations, which started anew on Tuesday in Geneva between the superpowers, a moratorium which excludes the deployment of further nuclear missiles and the "militarization of space." Before the press, Hans-Jochen Vogel, the deputy party chairman and leader of the opposition in the Bundestag, said on Tuesday in Bonn that otherwise there is a danger that the "crazy arms race" will continue unabated if not even faster in the shadow of the negotiations.

The Social Democrats welcomed that the three complexes of medium-range missiles, strategic armaments, and space armaments are being dealt with together. Of the Soviet state and party leader Konstantin Chernenko who died on Sunday, Vogel acknowledged that the 13 months of his office would long be characterized by the resumption of the dialogue between the nuclear superpowers.

CSO: 5200/2550

SPACE ARMS

UK FOREIGN SECRETARY HOWE INTERVIEW CLARIFIES EARLIER REMARKS ON SDI

AU261505 Vienna DIE PRESSE in German 26 Mar 85 p 1

[Report by Roland Hill, London correspondent, on interview given by Foreign Secretary Geoffrey Howe; date and place not specified]

[Excerpts] London -- In a DIE PRESSE interview British Foreign Secretary Howe referred to the forthcoming commemoration of the 30th anniversary of the signing of the Austrian State Treaty in Vienna as an opportunity for his country to again reconfirm the postwar European peace order.

Asked about his country's assessment of the Vienna State Treaty anniversary celebrations, the foreign secretary declared: "For Great Britain this is an opportunity to reaffirm our recognition of the peace that we have achieved in Europe since the end of World War II."

Since last weekend the participation of the foreign ministers from Austria's neighboring countries as well as of their counterparts from the United States, Great Britain, and France has been assured. Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko has also taken a positive stance on the invitation in principle. However, as far as potential bilateral talks on the occasion of the Vienna anniversary are concerned, Howe declared that it was too early to say whether such talks would materialize.

Howe, who on Thursday [28 March] will again discuss with his EC counterparts Spain's and Portugal's admission to the EC, expressed the hope that the third EC expansion will come off as planned, without any snags, on 1 January 1986.

Regarding President Reagan's "Strategic Defense Initiative," SDI, Howe endeavored to depict his earlier critical remarks -- he had spoken of a "Maginot-Line in space" -- as torn out of context. The Soviet Union must be prevented from succeeding in driving a wedge into the camp of the United States' Western allies, Howe said. According to him, it is wrong to believe that there could be a control of the SDI research stage.

"The backbone of my analysis was the four points on which Prime Minister Thatcher and President Reagan reached agreement in Washington, with a view to avoiding an arms race in space. These points were, first, that the world powers should not seek any superiority but an arms balance; second, that any SDI deployment must be the subject of negotiations; third, that we do not want any expansion or undermining of nuclear deterrence; and, fourth, that we are for low troop strengths on both sides," Howe now declared.

"We firmly support the SDI research stage, solely in view of the much greater USSR program in this sector." The USSR is today spending twice as much on space armament as the Western powers, the foreign secretary stressed in conclusion.

SPACE ARMS

GROMYKO FAILS TO CONVINCE GONZALEZ TO TAKE STAND ON SDI

Madrid DIARIO 16 in Spanish 1 Mar 85 p 5

[Article by Enrique Montanchez]

[Text] Prime Minister Felipe Gonzalez and the chief of Soviet diplomacy, Andrey Gromyko, met yesterday for 40 minutes at Moncloa Palace, but the talks of the two leaders continued at the luncheon which the head of the government hosted for the minister of foreign affairs of the USSR. Also attending were Fernando Moran, the ambassador of the Soviet Union to Madrid, Yuriy Dubinin, and the Spanish ambassador to Moscow, Jose Luis Xifra.

Shortly after 1:00 in the afternoon, the Soviet minister entered the Moncloa grounds in an armored black Mercedes made available to him by the government. He had had a brief rest at the Soviet Embassy, where he is staying. Gromyko arrived at 1130 hours yesterday morning at the State Pavilion at Barajas Airport, coming from Rome on an Aeroflot jet. He was received by Fernando Moran and high officials from the Palacio de Santa Cruz.

Starwars

The head of Soviet diplomacy asked Felipe Gonzalez what Spain's position was on the so-called "Starwars" (the plans of the two superpowers to place sophisticated weapons systems, including nuclear arms, in outer space). The Soviets give prime attention to this issue, as we observed scarcely a month ago when a number of newsmen saw Dubinin return to the topic over and over at a luncheon. Gromyko's European tour is for the purpose, diplomatic sources say, of trying to put together a front of European countries that will stand against American plans to militarize space. Gromyko's plan excludes the Federal Republic of Germany, a nation it considers closely tied to the interests of the United States.

Gromyko wastes no opportunities and although all the artillery of this operation is aimed at Great Britain, France and Italy -- the first two have their own nuclear deterrent force -- Soviet interest is also aimed at gaining the support of medium-size powers such as Spain. This is the meaning of the trip to Madrid, independently of the fact that during these two days, bilateral matters such as the degree of participation in NATO will also be taken up.

Government Silence

The Spanish Government does not wish to make an official pronouncement on the placement of nuclear weapons in space, according to reliable sources. When Gonzalez engages in calculated ambiguity with respect to NATO, provoking Washington's irritation, our diplomacy deems that it would be a political mistake to take a stand on "Starwars" and add more pressure from the United States, in case the decision were against the nuclearization of space. Moran did not deny that views will be exchanged on this matter.

Moran said yesterday that the visit by the Soviet diplomat will not serve to capitalize on tension between Spain and the United States following the most recent incidents such as the case of the two American diplomats who left Spain.

King Juan Carlos will meet with Gromyko this morning at La Zarzuela and the second round of talks between the two ministers will begin later, followed by a luncheon hosted by Moran at the Viana Palace. When this edition was going to press, it was not yet known whether Andrey Gromyko would give a press conference this afternoon. He did not hold one in Rome last Wednesday. The Soviet minister will leave Spain Saturday morning.

11,464

CSO: 5200/2543

7 May 85

SPACE ARMS

PCF'S GREMETZ CALLS FOR OPPOSITION TO 'STAR WARS'

PM121327 Paris L'HUMANITE in French 6 Apr 85 pp 1, 3

[Article by PCF Central Committee Secretary Maxime Gremetz: "France and 'Star Wars'"]

[Text] According to Mr Reagan and his envoys, who are making great efforts to "convince" the Europeans of this, the famous "Strategic Defense Initiative" is a peace program that will render nuclear weapons useless.

But the expression "star wars," which was quickly used to describe it (moreover the expression was coined by Mr Reagan himself!) is a much more accurate reflection of the situation: It is the threat of one of the most dangerous developments in the arms race since the horror of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

What is the purpose of this program? It is to deploy in space weapon systems that will make it possible to destroy enemy missiles before they enter the atmosphere. The idea of a kind of completely watertight "shield" protecting the populations is therefore being put forward. In fact, the plan relates only to the protection of military sites.

Furthermore, in the view of experts on these questions, American and others, any system, however sophisticated, would still allow through a "residue," which, in view of the present stocks accumulated on the earth, would nonetheless be the equivalent of 250 Hiroshima bombs! This would be done on the basis of a computer decision, because the response time of a few thousandths of a second would rule out not only all political and democratic control but even all human control.

Far from being the path of peace and disarmament, the plan to militarize space revives a destructive race. It violates international treaties which, like the so-called ABM treaty of 1972 limits this type of development. Mr Reagan's arguments that the aim would be to reduce nuclear weapons are belied by the facts. For instance, this is demonstrated by the decisions to increase the number and type of weapons produced (MX missiles and so forth). Moreover, it is possible to observe that things are no longer just at the research stage, because testing is under way (an interception test has taken place) and the famous "space shuttle" should soon be used to test the new space weapons.

In addition to the threat which such a policy poses for mankind's future, how can anybody fail to point out the cost of these projects? The experts themselves find it difficult to put forward figures. What is certain -- the funds have been allocated -- is that \$26 billion has been earmarked in the Pentagon budget for "research" alone between now and 1989. But with regard to spending on the energy necessary to operate the proposed systems, some people are putting forward the figure of \$1 trillion....

When you think how much these sums could do for social progress, for solving the tragedy of hunger and underdevelopment, how can anybody fail to say: "We really must find a different way, it is vital that all these sums be mobilized for the benefit of life!"

France is directly concerned from several viewpoints.

First, since there is a threat to peace and mankind's survival, our country cannot regard itself as "unaffected." Second, the cost of our country's involvement in such a course, in one form or another, would be considerable, and this would have extremely damaging effects on our economic and social development.

Furthermore, and this is not the least important point, the implementation of such a plan would call into question our "deterrent" force. The country or countries to be "protected" by space "shields," even if they are imperfect -- because how can anybody imagine that there would not be countermeasures on the other side -- are placing themselves in the position of being able to launch the first "strike." Thus, what now constitutes a trump card essential to our country's security would be rendered useless. It would spell the end of France's independence and sovereignty. As a result, the consequences for our country and our people would be extremely grave.

Faced with Reagan's pressures -- which seeks to involve France in this "adventure" -- we must put an end to conflicting statements and shilly-shallying. France stands to gain from resolutely opposing what is also known as the militarization of space, which has nothing to do with the development of research and achievements in space for peaceful purposes.

Moreover, this would be a positive contribution to the success of the Geneva negotiations which relate precisely to the reduction of strategic and medium-range weapons, and the nonmilitarization of space. France, which is a UN Security Council member, and a nuclear and space power, can play a role in achieving this, it has the means of so doing, and it is not alone!

Many countries share these worries, be they members of the Nonaligned Movement and neutral countries, the USSR, China (with its recent proposal for a moratorium on militarization), or other socialist countries, or Australia. France can play a leading role in this sphere. If we add to this the extreme sensitivity of people with very diverse views in all countries, on all continents -- which is reflected in the stances adopted by many political, trade union, religious and other forces -- we can say that there are now real possibilities for waging a great -- peaceful -- battle which can be won against the advocates of "star wars!"

-- A battle to freeze the deployment of all new missiles and weapons of mass destruction, in the East and in the West, during the Geneva negotiations; to freeze all research and tests aimed at militarizing space;

-- A battle to devote the resources now swallowed up in the arms race to social progress, development, and combating hunger;

-- A battle for the sovereignty and independence of our country guaranteed in particular by effective national defense, setting aside any hypothesis of European defense; these are the policies we think are likely to win support for action from all those men and women who want France to play its full role among the peoples for peace and disarmament.

The French Communists will try to do this with all those prepared to do so; it is in this spirit that the PCF organizations will contribute to the success of the initiatives which the appeal of 100 has announced for June.

SPACE ARMS

SOVIET, U.S. STANCES IN GENEVA CONTRASTED

AU031143 Prague RUDE PRAVO in Czech 2 Apr 85 p 1

[Editorial: "Different Approach--Different Aim"]

[Text] Among the most burning problems currently facing the planet earth and its inhabitants is, undoubtedly, the averting of the threat of a nuclear war. That is why all peace-loving people focus their vision on Geneva where the USSR and the United States are conducting talks on a whole set of problems concerning nuclear and space weapons.

The interest in these talks is now all the greater because the United States is evidently intensifying its feverish preparations for "star wars" and--in an attempt to "internationalize" the militarization of outer space--trying to drag other capitalist countries into the production of space weapons. That which the American administration is now undertaking, in close collaboration with the military-industrial complex, is very alarming.

Agreement was reached during the meeting between the USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs and the U.S. Secretary of State on 8 January that the objective of the forthcoming negotiations would be to "work out effective agreements aimed at preventing an arms race in space and terminating it on earth."

People all over the world received this news with relief. Their conviction was strengthened that--given an honest approach of both sides to these talks, their appropriate efforts, and harmony between their words and deeds--it should be possible to achieve a turnabout in the present situation and to remove the obstacles standing in the way of a complete and general liquidation of nuclear arms.

The Soviet Union has already provided unequivocal evidence of its unshakable will and endeavor to this effect. In the past years it has come up with a number of initiatives and proposals for disarmament and eliminating the threat of a nuclear war. And not only that. Unilaterally, to set an example that should be followed, it pledged not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. Unilaterally, it also declared its commitment not to launch any weapons into outer space. The world is still waiting in vain for similar commitments on the part of the United States.

The Geneva talks on a set of problems concerning both nuclear and space weapons constitute a new and realistic opportunity to achieve agreements that would mean embarking upon the road toward curbing and terminating the arms race. The key and most urgent issue is a comprehensive discussion of the question of space and nuclear weapons, because it is essential to speedily adopt measures heading off new rounds of the arms race.

President Reagan's administration tried to keep the problem of space weapons out of any negotiations but, finally, under the pressure of public opinion, it acceded to the consideration of questions concerning both nuclear and space weapons in their interrelationship. However, everything suggests that it is now trying to circumvent this central element of the agreement of 8 January. It would like to use the Geneva talks to cover up the further escalation of its feverish arms buildup. However, this approach, designed to deceive the world public, is not new.

Let us recall Washington's conduct at the previous Soviet-American talks in Geneva on intermediate-range nuclear missiles. The American delegation was literally indulging in empty talk there. It was resorting to all kinds of procrastinations and dodging maneuvers, all the while the Pentagon was engaged in feverish preparations for the development of first-strike nuclear missiles in the FRG and other states, and toward the end of 1983, started to deploy them. Thereby the United States thwarted to Geneva talks at that time. It dangerously exacerbated international tension and forced the socialist countries to take countermeasures.

After all these experiences, which give rise to concern, it is all the more essential that the United States approach the new Geneva talks responsibly and that it live up to the commitments which it assumed.

The words of Comrade Mikhail Gorbachev during his meeting with official representatives of the Socialist International in Moscow on 22 March have met with great response in the peace-loving circles of the world:

"We are resolutely opposed to the talks serving as a cloak for covering up the further escalation of the arms race. That is why the Soviet Union proposes that the two sides freeze their nuclear arsenals and halt further missile deployment. We are convinced that halting the deployment of new American missiles in Europe and, simultaneously, the expansion of Soviet countermeasures, would significantly contribute to resolving the whole complex of questions under discussion in Geneva."

The United States has reacted to this unequivocal position of the Soviet Union truly in its own peculiar way. A few days ago, President Reagan pushed through in the U.S. congress the allocation of yet more dollars for the production of new first-strike strategic missiles, the MX, which, incidentally, in a display of hypocrisy, he gave the Godly name of "peace keepers." He even recalled M. Kampelman, the U.S. delegation head, from the Geneva talks, to use him for the greatest possible pressure on congressmen. And Kampelman, instead of asserting the purpose of the Geneva talks, which is, inter alia, to "limit and reduce the number of nuclear arms," heeded Reagan and called for the approval of further expenditures on new strategic missiles.

The United States is now also trying to involve its NATO allies, as well as Japan, France, Israel, and Australia, in the new round of the arms buildup. It demands that they take part in the militarization of space financially as well as technologically. The governments of these countries know very well how extremely risky an undertaking this is and that the American strategists would not hesitate--as is apparent from their past statements--to sacrifice the European continent for the sake of U.S. aspirations for world rule.

Washington invites other governments' complicity in the initiation of this very dangerous round of the arms race not only by promising profits from orders for their arms industries, but it does not even shy away from exerting pressure on them and from issuing ultimatums.

This approach of the U.S. administration, as well as the endeavor of its delegation in Geneva to evade talks on the problem of averting the militarization of space and not to respect the agreement on the subject and objectives of these talks in all their parts, gives rise to justified fear that the American side would again like to misuse this forum to deceive the nations.

As always in the past, the Soviet Union is consistently guided in Geneva by the spirit and letter of the agreed principles and agreements, while at the same time not losing sight of the subject and objective of the talks, which is to avert the threat of a nuclear war. That with which the Soviet delegation came to Geneva is no longer a secret today. It has become known that it proposed to the American side the agreement on some measures that would favorably and constructively contribute to the success of the talks. This concerns, in particular, the proposed moratorium (freeze) for the duration of the talks on the production of space weapons, including a moratorium on all scientific and research work connected with the design of these weapons and on testing and deploying them.

These measures also include the aforementioned proposal for freezing the USSR's and the United States' strategic offensive weapons at their current quantitative level in terms of both the total number of nuclear warheads and the number of their carriers.

The USSR at the same time proposes that the deployment of American intermediate-range missiles in Europe be halted, with the Soviet Union simultaneously halting its countermeasures.

Such an extensive moratorium would no doubt represent a suitable point of departure for the successful conduct of talks. This Soviet proposal not only demonstrates the unshakable sincere will and endeavor of the USSR to arrive at constructive results in Geneva, but at the same time it shows that along the path toward halting the feverish arms buildup it is possible to make realistic and constructive steps while maintaining the principle of equality and equal security for both sides.

The Soviet peace initiatives are in full harmony with the aspirations and wishes of peace-loving people, as is borne out by numerous UN resolutions, including the resolution on the use of space for exclusively peaceful purposes.

Preventing the militarization of space and terminating the arms race on Earth is by now a universally acknowledged categorical imperative of our period. In defiance of this, the American "star wars" fanatics continue to indulge in the illusion that they will be able to implement their war plans and ensure for themselves world rule with the help of new nuclear arms systems. All the more urgent becomes the appeal that the United States renounce this senseless adventurous pursuit, that common sense and a sense of reality gain the upper hand in the American circles, and that the American side demonstrate its good will in negotiations on averting the threat of a nuclear war.

The example of the past years and the urgency of the current situation show that the Soviet Union, and other socialist countries, have never avoided constructive talks and honest dialogue to curb the feverish arms buildup, nor have they avoided any real steps toward this end. For a very long time now it has been the turn of the U.S. administration.

CSO: 5500/3032

SPACE ARMS

BRIEFS

SPD'S EHMKE ON 'STAR WARS'--Bonn, 8 Mar (DPA)--Europe must pay attention to the stability of its alliance and not let itself be downgraded to a zone of lesser security through the development of a space defense system for the American continent, the deputy chairman of the SPD parliamentary group, Horst Ehmke, said on Friday. In a reply to plans by Great Britain and NATO Secretary General Lord Carrington to support the U.S. project for a space defense system, Ehmke noted that negotiations between the two superpowers were not enough and that attempts must be made to secure a stop to the arms race through moratoriums. [Text] [Hamburg DPA in German 1641 GMT 8 Mar 85]

AUSTRALIA NOT INVOLVED IN SDI--The federal government has indicated it will not take part in research on the United States' so-called star wars plan. Australia is one of 17 governments asked by the United States to participate in the research. A spokesman for the defense minister, Mr Beazley, said in Canberra this morning that the government stood firm on its undertaking not to become involved in the program also known as the Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI]. The spokesman said the prime minister had also expressed Australia's position to the United States during his visit to Washington earlier this year. The government's response is at odds with the opposition, which says Australia should accept the invitation to take part in research. [Text] [Melbourne Overseas Service in English 0430 GMT 27 Mar 85]

CSO: 5200/4309

SALT/START ISSUES

REAGAN CAMPAIGN FOR CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL OF MX VIEWED

PM020909 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Apr 85 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent G. Vasilyev dispatch under the rubric "echo of the week":
"Congressmen, the President, and the MX"]

[Text] Washington, 31 Mar -- Something akin to an emergency was declared last week on Capitol Hill. Dark green military buses drove up to the steps of the Congress, which was cordoned off by reinforced police detachments, and took the legislators away. Up came limousines from which highly placed leaders of the administration emerged. Pentagon Chief Weinberger, Secretary of State Shultz, the president's National Security Adviser McFarlane, and other equally worried looking men hurried up the capitol steps. "Operation MX" was in full swing...

The U.S. Administration, people from the Pentagon, and the arms manufacturers have been making strenuous efforts to force through Congress a part of their strategic arms buildup program -- aimed at securing the allocation of \$1.5 billion for the building of a further 21 MX first-strike ICBMS. One week earlier the Senate -- the upper house of Congress -- voted in favor of such a decision under equally strong pressure from the U.S. Administration: now it was the turn of the House of Representatives.

The MX missile -- a 96-ton monster armed with nuclear warheads -- is an offensive, first-strike weapon. Even THE WASHINGTON POST calls it "provocative and destabilizing." The construction of the MX is part of an extensive program to build up America's strategic arms which also include the Midgetman and Trident-2 missiles and the B-1 and Stealth bombers. Plans are to build 100 MXs. Congress froze the decision on the 21 missiles last year. The administration is determined to force the decision through this year come what may.

It is no secret that many legislators have serious doubts, fears, and objections about building the MX. They believe that commissioning the new ICBMS will not only not strengthen U.S. security but, on the contrary, will make it even less stable by accelerating the arms race. Now that the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms have started in Geneva, sensible Americans believe, it is necessary not to speed up the arms race but to show restraint. And, of course, there are convincing economic arguments

against this military program. Why throw away billions of dollars (implementation of the full MX program will cost several tens of billions) at the same time as the administration is drastically cutting back on social programs in order to "save money?"

The White House is well aware of all this. That is why the legislators are being conditioned on such a massive scale.

In retrospect the newspapers are calling this campaign to twist the congressmen's arms quite unprecedented. The full arsenal of bourgeois "democracy" has been brought into operation: persuasion, threats, and the promise of privileges or loss of privileges. The theme of patriotism has been particularly emphasized. The prevailing atmosphere on Capitol Hill is such that a legislator voting against MX is said to be "betraying the interests" of his country. This campaign is headed by the U.S. president in person. It was to him that the congressmen were taken for the "brain-washing" session. It was he who tried to prove that the legislators were obliged to vote for the MX proposal to demonstrate "Americans' unity and cohesion" to the whole world and, above all, to the Soviet Union. Only thus, it is argued, "can concessions be obtained from the Soviets" at the Geneva talks.

The President was followed into battle by Kampelman, the head of the U.S. delegation to the nuclear and space arms talks, who was specially recalled from Geneva. You would not think this diplomat -- who is taking part in an important and delicate matter, namely, the elaboration of mutually-acceptable decisions on curbing the arms race on earth and preventing it in space -- to be the right one to "change his tune" and campaign for a buildup of those same armaments simply by moving from one part of the world to another. But according to Washington's current rules anything goes when the fulfillment of the program to rearm America is at stake. So Kampelman came to the rostrum to demand that MX be approved at all costs. A refusal by Congress to approve this decision, he claimed, will "inevitably prolong the Geneva talks."

This week Washington has witnessed an upsurge of that twisted logic which states that the path to peace lies across mountains of nuclear warheads and that to achieve disarmament you must begin by increasing arms stocks; and that international stability and security can only be safeguarded at the point of America's nuclear gun. The morality of the cowboy "Wild West," so alive on the banks of the Potomac, appeared clearly in the thinking and arguments of those people who hold the reins of power in the country. And many legislators -- last week senators, this week congressmen -- could not resist the hypnotic effect of this false logic, showed a lack of far-sightedness, and were afraid of being accused of being "soft on defense questions." The House of Representatives voted twice on the question of building the MX missiles. The first vote was 219 for, 213 against, the second 217 for, 210 against.

When calling on the legislators to vote for the MX missiles the administration leaders stated that in so doing they would be "sending out a signal to the whole world." The "signal" has indeed been sent. At a time when Soviet-U.S. talks designed to curb the arms race on earth and prevent it in space are in progress in Geneva, this signal can only be interpreted as evidence of America's malicious intentions and proof that it is hard to believe in the sincerity of Washington's statements regarding its desire to reduce, let alone eliminate the implements of nuclear death.

CSO: 1807/264

7 May 85

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

PEACE GROUP COLLECTS DATA ON MISSILES, BASES

Rotterdam HET VRIJE VOLK in Dutch 20 Mar 85 p 5

[Article: "Anti-Militarists Paying Special Attention to Volkel: Leftist BVD Keeping an Eye on Defense"]

[Text] A former factory in downtown Utrecht. Quite ordinary, but that is deceiving. Because the solidly middle-class facade conceals something that is noteworthy: the office of a leftist BVD [Domestic Security Agency], or rather the peace movement's newest pillar, the "Research Group" Stop the Cruise Missile.

Those who work there, quite busy with converting the entrance, waiting room, office, record office and kitchen, are just as anxious about snoopers as the real BVD. Security measures are busily being planned. Against normal vandalism. And against activity by the Right. "We are very vulnerable to that."

In order to achieve The Goal--stopping nuclear arms--the Research Group is diligently seeking people who "can provide interesting information" or "have the time and energy to get their teeth into a research job."

Way down in the well-secured cellar of the old factory is the group's main office. Out of security considerations the space is shared with AMOK, the Anti-Military Research Collective. We speak with Jannie Oosterhuis and Roger Vleugels. "No, no photographs please." They are members of the Research Group and of AMOK.

Utrecht--What on earth is one to think of a leftist BVD?

Action campaign leaders who operate like secret agents, with cameras under their coats and unlisted phone numbers? Young, idealistic girls who strike up acquaintances with bigwigs in order to thus worm revealing information out of them? An exaggeration? Just a bit, but not entirely.

The "Stop the Cruise Missiles" Research Group, personified by Jannie Oosterhuis and Roger Vleugels, is counting on civil servants, people in the military, politicians, workers and citizens who are to be involved with preparations for the deployment of cruise missiles. These people are acquainted with all kinds of interesting facts and can pass this information along--without pay--to the research group.

Jannie and Roger: "There are people within the system or with companies who do not agree with the missiles. Just like almost 60 percent of the population is against them. In this way, people with prior knowledge can leak information, and that's not unlikely. It's already happened in England. There the deployment of cruise missiles was delayed for a while after the daily THE GUARDIAN published a secret document."

Or take the situation in the Netherlands. "After the IKV [Interchurch Peace Council] came out with reports to the effect that the missiles were going to be deployed at the Peel base, we asked a number of people in that area to gather information on the base, land registry data, construction activities, and so on. Later the cabinet decided that the missiles would go to Woensdrecht. We then pass our information along to campaign groups so that they can better prepare campaigns. It is important that we get everything, especially for piecing together information; thus, this includes tips on the smallest details as well."

Pilfered

A little bit of factual data. The research group is an initiative by AMOK, which consists of 16 members, has office hours every Tuesday afternoon at Esdoornstraat 14 in Utrecht and publishes the magazine of the same name, AMOK, four times a year. The publication was compiled and distributed for the first time 2 years ago. The topics covered are hardly surprising: war and peace, oppression and the Third World. The publication obviously met a need, because it grew by leaps and bounds. At a certain point, the financial situation made it possible to rent space in the former milk plant, and after the group laid its hands on the entire files of the disbanded League of Military Draftees, the creation of AMOK was an accomplished fact.

The anti-militarists do not do things halfway. In no sense do they rely on their "big shot" informants, but work just as much through entirely legal means. They can boast of 130 subscriptions to military and political magazines, and have another 70 of these periodicals on their wish list. From the army they have "pilfered" various books and reading materials.

House Search

Those contacts who provide interesting material remain invisible in the AMOK documentation center. Naturally, since one has to be careful with these types of leaks.

"We know more than what is in our files. That's through our relations with the soldiers' movement, for example. It is also sometimes the case that someone sends in materials anonymously."

This last-mentioned happened with a "confidential" report by the Air Force intelligence service. It contained information about how campaign groups such as Onkruit operate. It was also clear from the contents of the report that the intelligence services--despite denials by the minister-- are indeed interested in the peace movement.

AMOK and the Research Group are aware that the BVD, the intelligence services and the Ministry of Defense have a more than passing interest in their doings. Their greatest fear thus has to do with a house search. Part of the documentation center is therefore housed in a shadow file. Jannie and Roger: "The sort of documentation that we are gathering here is public and available for the asking. Only the combination of data is perhaps punishable by law."

The Research Group is naturally focusing on the "hottest spot" in Holland, Woensdrecht. According to the members of the group, preparatory measures are being taken there for the cruise missiles. "Perhaps the same thing is happening here as in England and Italy. In those two countries the missiles are "parked" at other bases. The missiles for Comiso in Italy first went to Sogonella. Construction at Greenham Common had not yet been completed, so in that case as well, some of the missiles were temporarily deployed at a second American base. There are indications that Woensdrecht is not ready for the deployment of the 48 missiles either."

It is thus obvious that the group is keenly interested in the other air force bases in our country. That is why the ladies and gentlemen regularly go take a look at Volkel. Because there is already an American infrastructure set up there: stores, schools, a very tightly guarded storage space for nuclear warheads. In Woensdrecht all this is out of the question for quite some time.

Jannie and Roger: "Also, everything is set up properly around Volkel. Regular exercises with missiles make demands on the road network around the base. There is the question of strengthening bridges in the extended surrounding area. Roads are widened and metalled, sharp curves made wider.

"There is also construction activity at the base itself. Insofar as we've been able to trace, there is no talk of a change in the function of the base, which could explain all this activity. That could be the fault of our files but it could also point to sneaky preparations in connection with the cruise missiles."

For this reason, every anti-militarist should be keeping a close watch, Jannie and Roger say. "If you're keeping an eye on Woensdrecht, you should also look at Volkel."

12271

CSO: 5200/2540

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

GERMAN GREENS SPOKESMAN CRITICIZES MX, BELGIAN DECISIONS

LD220023 Hamburg DPA in German 1650 GMT 21 Mar 85

[Text] Bonn, 21 Mar (DPA) -- The Greens in the Bundestag have criticized the decision of the U.S. Senate to release funds for the construction of 21 MX missiles and also the decision of the Belgian Government on the deployment of cruise missiles. Military and political instability is increased as a result of these decisions, the incoming defense spokesman for the Greens in the Bundestag, Torsten Lange, said in Bonn on Thursday. According to Lange, who is to replace the Greens' representative on the Bundestag Defense Committee, Roland Vogt, the U.S. Government mindful of the Geneva negotiations, put "enormous pressure" on the U.S. Senate and the Belgian Government. The Geneva negotiations are "nothing other than an instrument for the purpose of a further increase in armaments." The U.S. Government wants to lead Western public opinion "to believe that the U.S. is prepared to refrain from crazy armaments projects."

CSO: 5200/2552

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

FRG DEFENSE MINISTER ON NATO NUCLEAR DISCUSSIONS, MX

DW261037 Mainz ZDF Television Network in German 1800 GMT 25 Mar 85

[Interview with Defense Minister Manfred Woerner by unidentified correspondent in Bonn on 25 March]

[Text] [Question] Mr Minister, decisions are now being made in the United States on the deployment of MX missiles. At the same time, the NATO countries, including the United States, are planning to discuss the reduction of nuclear warheads in Western Europe. How does this fit together?

[Woerner] There is no contradiction. As you rightly said, the Americans are also decreasing their nuclear potential here in Europe. The difference is that what is at stake in the intercontinental or strategic field is the restoration of the balance that has been lost by the Soviet arms buildup, the massive Soviet arms buildup. We plan to give a clear sign of self-restraint in Europe. We are moving toward the minimum number of short-range weapons and theater weapons we need to prevent war in the future as well.

[Question] In Montebello last year, it was decided to reduce the number of nuclear warheads in Western Europe by 1,400. Has enough been done to actually reach this goal? What will your position be on the issue in Luxembourg?

[Woerner] The Montebello decision stands. This means that, in addition to the 1,000 warheads we removed in 1980, we are committed to removing an additional 1,400. The NATO supreme commander has been instructed to examine which weapons are involved, and he will now provide us with an interim report. The Federal Government's position is clear. We want certain weapons to disappear entirely. In the first place, this applies to the Nike air defense system, but it also involves nuclear charges, or the so-called nuclear mines. Furthermore, we will reduce the number of short-range theater nuclear weapons. Then the matter at hand will be the modernization of the weapons that remain.

[Question] Do you mean to say that you also want all the so-called backpack nuclear mines to be removed from Western Europe, mines that have been the subject of recent discussions?

[Woerner] These backpack mines do not exist in the form described during the discussions. We have repeatedly stated this fact, and this remains unchanged. However, as I said, there are different types of nuclear demolition munitions, and it is the Federal Government's position that these weapons must be completely withdrawn from the FRG.

CSO: 5200/2552

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE

FINNISH FOREIGN MINISTER ASSESSES STOCKHOLM TALKS, CSCE

LD041117 Helsinki International Service in Finnish 0830 GMT 4 Apr 85

[Text] Foreign Minister Paavo Vayrynen says the Stockholm disarmament conference should move on to actual negotiations as soon as possible. Addressing a gathering in Helsinki this week, Foreign Minister Vayrynen said active mapping out of areas of understanding should be started.

Here is a report:

[Unidentified reporter] Foreign Minister Vayrynen stressed the importance of reaching results in Stockholm before the next follow-up meeting in Vienna in the autumn of 1986, so as to make possible the broadening of the Stockholm conference assignment to also cover disarmament questions. Mr Vayrynen said that when discussing the Stockholm conference it should be borne in mind that the CSCE process is an entity, all parts of which affect each other. Foreign Minister Vayrynen noted there will be several meetings arranged within the CSCE process to discuss the peaceful solution of conflicts, cooperation in the Mediterranean area, human rights, culture and contacts between people--the results of the Stockholm conference will be decided there in the light of this entity.

Mr Vayrynen went on to say that the discussion of disarmament matters within the CSCE process would mean a new area for the process that began in Helsinki. In the Finnish view, Foreign Minister Vayrynen said, the widening of the process in this direction would be of prime importance without forgetting the need for progress in the other sectors of the CSCE process.

CSO: 5200/2587

MUTUAL AND BALANCED FORCE REDUCTIONS

RAPPROCHEMENT NOTED AT VIENNA MBFR TALKS

DW111403 Mainz ZDF Television Network in German 1830 GMT 8 Mar 85

[Report by Peter Berg on MBFR negotiations in Vienna from the "Auslandsjournal" program]

[Excerpts] Once every week a small circle of the principal MBFR participants gather for a working meeting. This time it is at the place of the West German MBFR representative. These meetings are much more important for progress in the negotiations than the Thursday plenary meetings. At these meetings a remarkable rapprochement of the positions was recently attained with regard to the solution of the two points that are still controversial: the data dispute and the problem of verification.

If we take what both East and West have proposed here, we can say that the framework of an agreement has been established. Both sides exhibit cautious optimism.

[Begin GDR envoy Andre Wieland recording] May I tell you, to begin with, that the sluggish pace of these negotiations absolutely is neither in the interest of the Warsaw Pact states, nor would it have been necessary. It would not be hard for me to make it clear to you and to prove how much the Warsaw Pact states endeavored to score initial progress here, up to the well known unilateral pullout of Soviet troops from the GDR.

Nevertheless, we will continue not to be satisfied with the situation in central Europe, the great concentration -- the nonsensically great concentration -- of armed forces and weapons. This is the motive for our negotiations here. [end recording]

[Begin FRG envoy Josef Holik recording] Sending a few thousand soldiers, more or less, home is not what matters to us. The difficulty in back of the technical problems you mentioned is that part of Europe in which the armed forces of the two military alliances are facing each other is greatest concentration. We must find in accords between potential adversaries a more stable security order for our continent. This task can indeed be solved because, especially with respect to the political dimension of the negotiations, there are many important points of accord between East and West. We might even say that it has been possible to develop a conceptional framework for an agreement which boils down to an established parity on a lower level in central Europe. [end recording]

The pullout of Soviet troops at the time [from the GDR in 1979] was a move in the campaign against the deployment of U.S. Pershing missiles in central Europe. In the meantime, the West knows more about the reasons for it. The Soviet troops were regrouped at the time anyway, and it is doubtful whether their overall number was thereby reduced. Hence, does this example fit into the Vienna negotiations?

[Begin Brigadier General Wolfgang Heydrich, FRG delegation in Vienna, recording] Conditionally it fits, because the example shows that under the proviso of the permission of unrestrained observation it is possible to ascertain that certain troop components are withdrawn. But it is far from sufficient for the MBFR requirements for verification, essentially for two reasons: First the volume as a whole must become verifiable, and this is possible only if the entire reduction can be ascertained and added up by experts at specific points. Second, and much more important, it must be ensured that these reductions will not be balanced again through subsequent replenishments.

This means that it is absolutely necessary to ensure that there will be constant verifiability of the armed forces remaining in the area involved. The aforementioned example did not live up to these two conditions. [end recording]

It is the misfortune of the Vienna conference that the important decisions cannot be made here but solely in Washington and Moscow. It is a vicious circle. The long time of the conference -- 12 years without any result -- has made the political interest dwindle, but there cannot be any result without political interest.

The pleasant part for all people involved is that everything ends Thursday noon, and as everybody knows, Vienna is a very pleasant city. How long this state of affairs will continue is hard to say, yet it cannot be ruled out that the two great powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, suddenly discover that they could improve their mutual relationships with the help of the Vienna conference. Then an agreement would soon be concluded; for that everything has been prepared.

CSO: 5200/2552

MUTUAL AND BALANCED FORCE REDUCTIONS

WARSAW PACT'S NEW PROPOSALS FOR MBFR OUTLINED

AU021405 Prague RUDE PRAVO in Czech 30 Mar 85 p 6

[Article by Ludek Handl (CSSR delegation leader to MBFR talks) and Jozef Sestak: "On the Proposal of the Socialist Countries at the Vienna Disarmament Talks; A Realistic Direction for Europe"; uppercase passages published in bold-face]

[Text] ON 14 FEBRUARY AT THE VIENNA NEGOTIATIONS ON THE MUTUAL REDUCTION OF ARMED FORCES AND ARMAMENTS IN CENTRAL EUROPE, AMBASSADOR VALERIAN MIKHAILOV, THE HEAD OF THE SOVIET DELEGATION, SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF THE CSSR, THE GDR, THE PPR, AND THE USSR -- THE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS IN THESE NEGOTIATIONS -- THE DRAFT OF THE BASIC PROVISIONS OF AN AGREEMENT ON AN INITIAL REDUCTION BY THE USSR AND THE UNITED STATES OF LAND FORCES AND ARMAMENTS IN CENTRAL EUROPE AND THE SUBSEQUENT NONINCREASE IN THE LEVELS OF THE SIDES' ARMED FORCES AND ARMAMENTS IN THIS REGION. WHAT HAS LED THE AFOREMENTIONED SOCIALIST COUNTRIES TO THIS CONSTRUCTIVE STEP, AND WHAT IS ITS ESSENCE AND IMPORTANCE? BEFORE IT IS POSSIBLE TO ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS, IT WOULD BE USEFUL TO RECAPITULATE THE SITUATION IN THIS DISARMAMENT FORUM.

It is appropriate to recall that the PRAGUE SESSION OF THE POLITICAL CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE WARSAW PACT IN JANUARY 1983 CONVEYED TO ALL WESTERN PARTICIPANTS IN THESE NEGOTIATIONS AN URGENT APPEAL to speedily overcome the prolonged impasse and, in the shortest possible time, successfully wind up the negotiations -- which even then had already lasted 10 years -- by concluding a comprehensive agreement. The highest representatives of the socialist countries -- the member-states of the Warsaw Pact -- at the same time unequivocally expressed their stance on these disarmament negotiations when they emphasized that they are "again expressing themselves in favor of the reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe, and consider achieving progress at the Vienna negotiations, which have been going on for a number of years already, to be particularly urgent." They also gave the assurance "on their part they will do their utmost to help this."

New Approach

It is not the practice of the socialist countries to convey to the world public political declarations that are not supported by concrete deeds, a matter that can also be documented concerning their further approach in Vienna. Immediately, namely in February 1983, they concretized the conclusions from the Prague Political Declaration on that forum in the form of a package of new proposals which included a radically new and practical approach to removing the greatest obstacle which has been blocking

the Vienna negotiations for years -- the so-called numerical barriers and the concrete scheme for achieving the agreed objective of the negotiations in accordance with the mandate of the Vienna negotiations.

The new approach is the proposal to avoid useless dispute about the two sides' beginning troop force levels in the region -- a dispute that was started and artificially nurtured by the NATO side -- and instead CONCENTRATE ON THE "FINAL" FORCE LEVEL. This would be achieved following the reduction of troops and armaments up to agreed and collective ceilings -- that is, 900,000 troops for each side, of which 700,000 would be ground troops and 200,000 air force personnel.

At the same time each side would itself determine the type of cuts it needs to reach this parity of troops on a lower level. Regarding the reduction process, the socialist countries proposed carrying out 3 steps. AS THE FIRST AND SYMBOLIC STEP, to reduce a part of the USSR and U.S. troops on the basis of mutual example.

AS THE SECOND STEP, TO FREEZE THE EXISTING LEVEL OF ARMED FORCES AND ARMAMENTS OF ALL DIRECT PARTICIPANTS IN THE NEGOTIATIONS (the CSSR, the GDR, the PPR and the USSR on the side of the Warsaw Pact, and Belgium, Canada, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, the FRG, the United States, and Great Britain on the NATO side) on the basis of the political pledges of the parties. AND AS THE THIRD STEP, TO CONCLUDE A COMPREHENSIVE AGREEMENT ON A SUBSTANTIAL REDUCTION IN ARMED FORCES AND ARMAMENTS TO EQUAL THE AFOREMENTIONED AGREED COLLECTIVE LEVELS.

Shortly afterwards, in June 1983, the head of the CSSR delegation submitted on behalf of the Warsaw Pact states a homogenous and comprehensive text of the draft of an Agreement on the Mutual Reduction of Armed Forces and Armaments and the Accompanying Measures in Central Europe. In the months that followed, representatives of the socialist countries patiently explained the individual parts of the complex of their proposals and further developed some parts of these far-reaching initiatives.

NATO'S ANSWER, despite the fact that it was long in coming and was depicted as the "initiative of the West of 19 April 1984" WAS NEITHER CONSTRUCTIVE NOR COMMENSURATE. The seemingly modified approach preserved to its full extent the data issue, and thus the absurd concept of asymmetric reduction, on the basis of which the Warsaw Pact states would have to reduce to a substantially greater extent than the NATO states, a matter that would obviously lead to gaining unilateral military advantages and to reducing the safety of the socialist countries. That proposal did not resolve a single one of the key issues of the negotiations; it did not draw closer but instead deepened the differences between the sides' positions on a number of aspects. The proposal thus left the negotiations in the same blind alley in which the actions of the West earlier placed them. Therefore, the socialist countries called on Western participants to fundamentally reassess their nonconstructive stance.

Concentrating on Issues Where the Positions of the Sides Are Closest

In assessing the situation in negotiations at the end of last year, the socialist countries arrived at the conclusion that, if further negotiations were to be business-like and productive, IT WOULD BE USEFUL TO CONCENTRATE ON THOSE SPHERES IN WHICH THE

POSITIONS OF THE SIDES ARE CLOSEST AND THUS WHERE CONCRETE AGREEMENTS COULD BE REACHED, agreements that would at last make it possible to begin the process of really [realne] reducing armed forces and armaments in central Europe. Led by the permanent endeavor to halt the arms race, and with the intention of giving the Vienna disarmament negotiations an additional impetus, they decided to submit a new constructive proposal, which is a logical extension of their package proposals of 1983 and which is built precisely on spheres in which the relatively greatest degree of understanding had been reached. As can be seen from the very title of the submitted document, this involves initial reduction of a part of the USSR and U.S. ground forces and a subsequent freeze on the troops and armaments of the Warsaw Pact member-states and NATO stationed in central Europe.

In these spheres many issues were elaborated, something which creates a good opportunity for achieving the first concrete agreement that could be implemented in a short time and without necessary delays.

THE PROPOSAL ENVISIONS A CONTRACTUAL-LEGAL OBLIGATION TO REDUCE, WITHIN 1 YEAR AFTER THE AGREEMENT BECOMES EFFECTIVE, USSR AND U.S. GROUND FORCES IN CENTRAL EUROPE BY 20,000 AND 13,000 MEN RESPECTIVELY, by combat units, together with their weapons and combat equipment, to involve up to 10 percent of individual military personnel.

The proposal proceeds from the two sides' agreement that the process of reducing and restricting armed forces in central Europe should be started only by the USSR and the United States, that this initial reduction should be concluded within a year, and that the manner of the reduction will be identical for the USSR and the United States. The wish of the Western participants concerning the ratio of combat units and individuals to the number of troops reduced (90 percent and 10 percent) was respected.

The proposals also retain the existing mutual accord that the USSR AND U.S. TROOPS SO REDUCED WILL BE TRANSFERRED TO THEIR OWN TERRITORIES AND DEPLOYED IN THEIR NEW LOCATIONS IN SUCH A WAY AS NOT TO THREATEN THE SECURITY OF ANY OF THE STATES PARTICIPATING IN THE NEGOTIATIONS, including participants having a special status -- the so-called flank states neighboring on the central European region (the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Hungarian People's Republic, the Socialist Republic of Romania, Denmark, Italy, Norway, Greece, and Turkey).

The proposal further envisages that, after conclusion of the initial reduction, the signatories of the agreement will pledge -- on a collective and national basis -- NOT TO INCREASE THE LEVEL OF THEIR ARMED FORCES AND ARMAMENTS IN CENTRAL EUROPE FOR 2 YEARS. Also here it proceeds from the two sides' fundamental agreement on the idea of a freeze, while taking into account in many respects the stances of the Western participants in the negotiations, above all the contractual-legal expression of the pledge for a freeze, and determining a concrete length of time for validity of the pledge.

The proposal contains concrete measures to ensure fulfillment of the agreement. The measures COUNT ON THE USE OF NATIONAL TECHNICAL MEANS OF VERIFICATION, ON THE EXCHANGE OF APPROPRIATE INFORMATION, AND ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THREE TO FIVE CONTROL STATIONS ON EACH SIDE at the points through which withdrawal of the Soviet and American troops from central Europe will be carried out.

Switching to Practical Steps

One of the extremely important stipulations of the new proposal is the side's contractual-legal pledge to continue negotiations about a further, more extensive reduction of armed forces and armaments with the objective of achieving an equal collective level of armed forces of 900,000 each of which 700,000 on each side would be ground troops.

It is only understandable that the proposal presupposes the reduction of a part the USSR and U.S. ground forces together with their weapons and combat equipment, as well as a freeze not only on armed forces, but also weapons because only such a course would lead to a genuine reduction in the level of military confrontation.

There is no doubt that the new proposal of the socialist countries is constructive, flexible, shows willingness to compromise, and can be easily realized. It expands the spheres of achieved mutual understanding and, in the interests of facilitating the achievement of an agreement, although limited for the time being, does not contain some controversial problems that will of course have to be resolved within the framework of the future comprehensive agreement.

The main advantage of the proposal is that it PAVES THE WAY FOR A REAL REDUCTION OF ARMED FORCES AND ARMAMENTS IN CENTRAL EUROPE FIRST ON THE BASIS OF CONCRETE AND TANGIBLE RESULTS. The view of the socialist countries is namely that it is time to end theoretical discussions and now switch to practical disarmament steps. It is from this view that the Warsaw Pact member-states proceed in submitting their new draft, which is based on the principle of equality and equal security for both sides and which is open to pragmatic debate. It now depends on whether the response of the West will be constructive. The nature of the NATO states' response will be the test of their political will to begin reducing the disproportionate concentration of troops and armaments in central Europe -- this neuralgic part of Europe, where the two strongest military-political groupings are facing each other and where the largest military potential in the world is concentrated.

Conclusion and implementation of such an agreement would have immense political and military importance. It would have a positive influence on the atmosphere of further work at the Vienna negotiations, it would demonstrate in practice the willingness of all participating parties to truly reduce the level of military confrontation, and it would contribute to stabilization of the military-political situation in Europe. It would yield the first practical experience in troop, reduction application of the appropriate verification measures, and the functioning of the freeze. Last, but not least, it would increase trust among the states and nations of Europe and create favorable prerequisites for achievement of the final objective of the negotiations, which is to substantially reduce armed forces and armament in central Europe and achieve parity on a lower level.

Such a result would have exceptional significance in this year -- the 40th anniversary of the victory of the antifascist coalition in the most pernicious war in the history of mankind.

CSO: 5500/3018

MUTUAL AND BALANCED FORCE REDUCTIONS

DAILY ON NEW MBFR PROPOSALS, WESTERN RESPONSE

AU301813 Bratislava ROLNICKE NOVINY in Slovak 28 Mar 85 p 7

[Commentary by M. Smolik: "Unused Possibilities"]

[Text] The 35th round, and first this year, of the talks between 7 Warsaw Pact member-states and 12 NATO states on reducing arms and armed forces in central Europe will end in the Vienna Hofburg today. These are the most drawn-out talks in the history of European diplomacy. They have been underway for more than 11 years. Yet the results so far are very modest and unsatisfactory, if we consider that the negotiations have not yielded agreement on a single document. Not even one line of the future agreement has been fixed in writing thus far. This is due to the refusal of the NATO states--caused by their continued quest for unilateral advantages in the form of an "asymmetrical" reduction that is designed to harm the states of the Warsaw Pact--to anchor in the text of the eventual agreement the joint positions on various questions already arrived at.

The fact that the basic issues of the future agreement are still open and that the talks stand still is, above all, a consequence of three main obstacles, all of them erected by the West. First--the exacerbated international situation. Second--the unfavorable situation in Europe, owing mainly to the deployment of American intermediate-range nuclear missiles in some West European countries. And third--the dangerous conventional arms build-up of NATO member-states and the FRG, in particular, on the basis of a resolution of the NATO Council. These factors have exerted an influence on the Vienna talks, in spite of the fact that, in their attempt to avert a nuclear catastrophe, the Warsaw Pact member-states have been striving at this forum, in defiance of the exacerbated international situation, to free the way for a dialogue, and have submitted proposals that make it possible to overcome the different approaches.

It was again the socialist countries that gave a new impetus to the Vienna talks during this round. With the aim of achieving the first specific results, the CSSR, USSR, GDR and the Polish People's Republic--all direct participants in the talks--tabled the draft of basic provisions of an agreement on the initial reduction of the ground troops and armaments of the USSR and the United States in central Europe and the subsequent forsaking of increases in the number of troops and armaments in this area. What is the

gist of this proposal? The socialist countries propose that in the current stage of talks efforts should be concentrated on the attainment of an agreement on the reduction of Soviet and American troops in central Europe. It is being proposed that the number of Soviet soldiers be reduced by 20,000 and the number of American soldiers by 13,000 in the course of the year, which are numbers that even the United States described as acceptable for pulling out from the area. Once this reduction is completed, the signatories would pledge on a collective and national basis not to increase the level of their armed forces and armaments while the agreement is in force. This step is designed to speed up the talks on the further reduction of armed forces and armaments so that, finally, armed forces in central Europe would total a maximum of 900,000 men on each side, of whom 700,000 would be members of the ground forces. This removes one of the obstacles used by the Western states in Vienna in arguing against the possibility of an agreement--the discussion about the numbers of deployed troops. The NATO states stated in Vienna that they have 991,000 men under arms; the armed forces of the Warsaw Pact member-states number 979,000 men. The Western participants argue that, supposedly, the data given by the Warsaw Pact do not tally with those which they obtained with their technical devices. At the same time, they refuse to state the facts on the basis of which they accuse the socialist countries. They thereby complicate the talks and keep them at an impasse.

The Western participants in the Vienna talks were given a new opportunity to finally manifest with deeds their readiness to responsibly approach the subject of the talks, to reexamine their previous position, and to live up to the agreed mandate of the talks. However, none of this has happened. During the round that is now drawing to an end, they have not taken any practical steps to bring the talks ahead and have avoided the solution of the basic problems directly connected with reducing the level of military confrontation in central Europe. The West has not yet given a businesslike and constructive answer to the new proposals of the socialist countries.

CSO: 5500/3018

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

GDR: WASHINGTON CONTINUES CHEMICAL WARFARE PREPARATIONS

DW021440 East Berlin Voice of GDR Domestic Service in German 1110 GMT 2 Apr 85

[Egbert Von Frankenberg Commentary]

[Text] It is no coincidence that the demand of the peace-loving world public for a halt to and ban of nuclear armament and of so-called star wars is accompanied by the demand for the final ban of all chemical weapons. The U.S. aggression in Vietnam has not been forgotten. In that case the United States over a period of more than 10 years used the better part of the territory of another country with many million people as a test ground for chemical weapons. It was the chemical warfare of the United States. Destruction of the ecology and annihilation of human beings by herbicides and diocane (Dioxin) toxic agents were part of the strategy and tactics of the U.S. imperialism.

According to foreign press reports chemical plants controlled by U.S. capital produced more than 100,000 of these dangerous agents in the period from 1957 to 1970. NATO Supreme Commander General Rogers, talking to newsmen, boasted that great quantities of chemical agents, so-called binary weapons, are stockpiled in Western Europe. The new statutes of the U.S. Army--Airland Battle--mentions the concerted action of conventional, nuclear, chemical, and electronic means of warfare. These are the complexes for the mass annihilation of man, fauna, and flora which are to be used in massive strikes into the depth of the enemy defense lines.

New Chemical weapons consist of two relatively slightly toxic agents which when mixed, however, form a lethal nerve-paralyzing gas. In April 1982, a symposium was held in the newly opened training center for chemists at Fort (MacClallon) on questions concerning chemical warfare in Europe in which more than 400 representatives of the U.S. military, from circles of science and industry, and representatives of 150 U.S. chemical companies participated.

To camouflage its activities for the preparation of chemical war the U.S. administration has even demanded a ban of the chemical weapons. A particular point of the demand is verification, albeit with a trick. In the opinion of U.S. politicians the production of state chemical plants is to be controlled by international verification. In contrast, the United States most decidedly rejects the control of private factories. But there are no state chemical plants in the United States; it was private companies which produced 100,000 tons of toxic agents for the chemical war in Southeast Asia from 1961 to 1972.

There is yet another trick to it: If ever an agreement on a ban should emerge, in the case of alliances of several states one state could stay out of the convention and produce chemical weapons for the others. Moreover, the Geneva protocol pertaining to the ban of all poison-gas weapons has been existing since June 1925. The United States, too, signed it, but unlike the Soviet Union it never ratified it.

From all this we can only conclude that every scientist, chemist and every normally thinking person is obligated to advocate the preparation of an international convention, binding under international law, on the complete ban and the destruction of all chemical weapons arsenals as well as on the ban of the test of these weapons, and to demand that these weapons be outlawed as a crime against humanity.

CSO: 5200/3035

7 May 85

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

REPORTAGE ON REACTION, OPPOSITION TO SHIP BAN IN NEW ZEALAND

Opinion Growing Against Stand

HK051150 Hong Kong AFP in English 1055 GMT 5 Mar 85

[By Ray Lilley]

[Text] Wellington, 5 March (AFP)--Pressure is building here against New Zealand's anti-nuclear warship stand, with one group today calling it worrying and joining others seeking a referendum on the issue which has rocked the ANZUS Defense Alliance.

The country's war veterans today began to falter in their support for the Labor government's anti-nuclear policies, calling for an urgent meeting with Prime Minister David Lange.

Returned Servicemen's Association (RSA) President Sir William Leuchars said the latest developments in the ANZUS row were "worrying" and the country "must now decide on the issue."

"We are most disappointed in the postponement of the ANZUS Council meeting because I think a lot could be discussed at that particular meeting," Sir William said. "Everybody says ANZUS still exists, then why aren't we talking within it?"

(In a statement made available in Canberra today, New Zealand Acting Prime Minister Geoffrey Palmer announced that Australian Prime Minister Bob Hawke and Mr Lange were to meet in Canberra next month to discuss bilateral defence arrangements following the breakdown of ANZUS.)

The 34-year-old ANZUS pact links Australia, New Zealand and the United States and is a cornerstone of New Zealand defense policy.

The Labor government elected last July carried out its anti-nuclear stand last month by refusing a visit by a U.S. warship capable of being nuclear-powered or carrying nuclear weapons, prompting its biggest row with its biggest ally since World War II.

Since then, ANZUS military exercises have been cancelled and yesterday Australia announced postponement of an annual council of top representatives from ANZUS countries.

Jim McLay, head of the opposition National Party, which accepts nuclear warship visits as one of its main policy planks, described the postponement as "a low point of the relationship between New Zealand and the U.S."

Sir William today called for a public referendum on the policy. His statements were among the first indications that the situation was causing growing concern within the country.

While anti-nuclear groups flourish and continually congratulate the government for its resolve, others opposing the policy have increased their demands for a referendum. A recent public opinion poll showed that four out of five New Zealanders would welcome such a public test.

Yet three recent polls have confirmed that the Labor government's support was holding firm despite the row, with the latest putting support at 44 percent, unchanged from that of the July election.

At the same time, the National Party has picked up 6 percent in the past 7 months to lag only two points behind Labor.

Defense chiefs and senior officers have maintained a wall of silence on the issue, but retired heads of defense have warned of the policy's potential for damaging the U.S. connection in New Zealand's cornerstone of defense.

Newspapers without exception have condemned the policy as dangerous, even wrecking the country's defense system.

U.S. Ambassador to New Zealand Monroe Browne added to the opposition's hopes today in a speech to a church group where he said that the United States "has not closed the door on New Zealand."

He emphasized that the measures taken were "all reversible and we want to reverse them" but that the nuclear warship ban must be cancelled first.

Political analysts say the New Zealand Government was most vulnerable on the ANZUS issue. They point out that polls have shown consistently that nearly four out of every five voters wants the country to remain within ANZUS.

Lang Reaffirms Southeast Asia Commitment

HK081432 Hong Kong AFP in English 1408 GMT 8 Mar 85

[Text] Singapore, 8 March (AFP)--New Zealand Prime Minister David Lange today restated his country's commitment to the defence of Malaysia and Singapore, and pledged to maintain a military presence here for "a very long time."

He said he gave the assurance to Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamad today during a brief meeting in Kuala Lumpur, and to Singapore Premier Lee Kuan Yew and Foreign Minister Suppiah Dhanabalan in separate meetings yesterday.

Mr Lange was addressing a news conference at the end of a 3-day visit here, the last stop of a hectic fortnight of travel covering Washington, London and Geneva to reassure allies about New Zealand's defence policy.

The hardline anti-nuclear stand of Mr Lange's Labour Party government has led to the ban of nuclear-armed or nuclear-powered ships from New Zealand ports.

This has shaken Wellington's place in the ANZUS alliance between New Zealand, Australia and the United States. U.S. ships were the first to be affected.

The rift in the ANZUS pact has caused concern in Singapore and Malaysia, analysts said.

The two countries depend on Australia and New Zealand for military cover against what they perceive as the growing Soviet threat to anti-communist Southeast Asia.

New Zealand has stationed ground troops here, and Australia combat and surveillance planes in Malaysia, under a 1971 military arrangement with Britain which pulled out troops from these former colonies.

Mr Lange said if New Zealand were to withdraw its infantry regiment, which he today reviewed in action in the jungles of southern Malaysia, it would be only by mutual consultation.

The cancellation of New Zealand's military exercises with U.S. forces would be compensated for with its continued training manouvres with Australian, Singaporean and Malaysian units, he added.

He said 120 Singapore troops had flown out to New Zealand yesterday for a series of exercises and later this month, New Zealand will hold air, sea and land exercises with Australia in New South Wales.

Before leaving for Auckland Mr Lange had a brief meeting with Indonesian Foreign Minister Mokhtar Kusumaatmaja at Singapore airport, official sources said. But no details of the talks were available.

Envoy Defends Policy

BK060951 Melbourne Overseas Service in English 0830 GMT 6 Mar 85

[Text] The New Zealand high commissioner to Australia, Mr (Graham Ansel), has defended the New Zealand Government's ban on the entry of nuclear-capable warships to its ports. During a speech to the Canberra branch of the Institute of International Affairs, Mr (Ansel) stressed that the government in New Zealand had not become anti-American. He said his country had always pulled

its weight as a member of the Western alliance and intended to continue doing so. Mr (Ansel) spoke about the ANZUS defense alliance, which links Australia, New Zealand and the United States.

He said the New Zealand Government insisted that the treaty was a conventional one not a nuclear alliance. Mr (Ansel) pointed out that, while the New Zealand Government's policy antinuclear, it was not anti-American or anti-ANZUS alliance. He said New Zealand was not making some sharp turn in its foreign policy toward neutralism or nonalignment.

Lange Steadfastness on Oxford Debate

HK280110 Wellington Overseas Service in English 2300 GMT 27 Feb 85

[From the "Midday Report" program]

[Text] The prime minister, it seems, will now be speaking to the Oxford Union on Friday night. It had been said earlier that the debate would not proceed. Details from our reporter Mark Scott:

[Begin Scott recording] The confusion arose from suggestions that the other prime participant, U.S. Moral Majority leader Reverend Jerry Falwell, was not happy with the topic of the debate, that all nuclear weapons are immoral. It was reported Mr Falwell wants to include some discussion in the Western alliance, and that the so-far-unknown owner of the U.S. television rights also wanted the Western alliance involved.

However, Mr Lange stuck firm to what he regarded as a firm agreement. After discussions between the organizers of the debate and the two main participants, it is apparently agreed that the debate will go ahead under the title that nuclear weapons are morally indefensible. Mr Lange does not regard that as a climbdown from his previous position, saying that the two propositions mean the same thing and will allow him to discuss in front of a huge audience this vital part of the government's policy.

However, despite that apparent agreement, there is still some unease here in London that the whole issue is still not finally and totally settled.
[End recording]

CSO: 4200/608

NUCLEAR TESTING

USSR REPLIES TO U.S. GROUP ON NUCLEAR TESTS MORATORIUM

LD171421 Moscow TASS in English 1416 GMT 17 Apr 85

[Text] Moscow, April 17, TASS--The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet received an address from Gene R. Larocque and Eugene J. Carroll, leaders of the American "Center for Defense Information," calling for a moratorium on all nuclear weapons tests beginning with August 6, 1985, the 40th anniversary of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima.

The USSR Embassy in Washington was instructed to convey a reply to that address. The reply points out, inter alia, that the Soviet Union has more than once addressed the United States and the other nuclear powers with the proposal to put an end to all nuclear weapons tests. To provide auspicious conditions for drafting an appropriate treaty, the USSR suggested such a practicable measure as a moratorium by all the nuclear powers on all nuclear explosions beginning with an agreed upon date.

The Soviet Union agrees that the moratorium goes into effect on August 6, 1985, the 40th anniversary of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima, as the authors of the address suggest. If the other nuclear powers display positive attitudes, such a moratorium could be declared even earlier and remain in effect till the conclusion of a treaty on the complete and universal prohibition of nuclear weapons tests. In the present-day situation, the reply stresses, a halt to nuclear explosions could constitute a very substantial step towards folding up the nuclear arms race.

The reply also reiterates the Soviet Union's readiness for the immediate resumption of the talks on the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons tests. The USSR also suggests that the Soviet-U.S. treaties on the limitation of underground nuclear weapons tests and on underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, signed in 1974 and 1976 but not yet ratified, not through the fault of the Soviet side, be put into effect.

All these steps can be taken regardless of the progress of the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva. At the same time these measures would provide more favourable conditions for the fruitful progress of the Geneva talks aimed at preventing an arms race in space and at terminating it on earth.

CSO: 5200/1100

NUCLEAR TESTING

FINLAND DEVELOPING EXPERTISE TO MONITOR POSSIBLE TEST BAN

Helsinki HELSINGIN SANOMAT in Finnish 15 Apr 85 p 17

[Text] In addition to having a capacity to monitor chemical weapons, Finland for several years has been developing know-how in the area of seismological monitoring of [nuclear] weapons, according to Defense Minister Veikko Pihlajamaki (Center Party).

Speaking at Seinajoki on Sunday [14 April], Pihlajamaki said that the objective in this project is to create the technical requirements for impartial monitoring of a nuclear test ban.

"Finland for many years has been developing its capacities for monitoring chemical weapons, and someday, hopefully as soon as possible, an agreement for prohibiting chemical weapons could be reliably monitored," said Pihlajamaki.

In addition to this little-known contribution by Finland in the international security effort, a fundamental knowledge of nuclear-test monitoring is being built.

"Finland already for many years has been developing its seismological know-how for the purpose of weapons monitoring. The objective of this project has been to create the technical means for an impartial monitoring of a nuclear test ban, provided that the political preconditions for such a ban treaty would come about," said Pihlajamaki.

CSO: 5200/2579

END